leased by it to another railroad for not more than the balance of said term, upon such terms and conditions as in the judgment of the board are most favorable, and the leasing of such equipment need not be subject to such terms of the standard lease as the board deems inappropriate in the circumstances.

(c) When the administration repossesses railroad equipment at the end of the term of the original lease, or is unable to re-lease equipment repossessed prior thereto, the administration shall offer to sell such equipment to the department or agency of the U.S. Government designated by the President by Executive order to undertake the stockpiling of railroad equipment. The sale price for each unit shall be the fair value as determined by agreement between the administration and such agency, but in no case may be less than the then scrap value of the said equipment. The department or agency acquiring such railroad equipment for stockpiling purposes shall not thereafter dispose of the same for other purpose than scrapping the said equipment, except that (1) in the event of national emergency declared by the President or by joint resolution of the Congress, or (2) pursuant to a decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission that a shortage exists in particular classes or types of railroad equipment, any such equipment may be temporarily released for use by the railroads under appropriate terms and conditions until new equipment can be acquired.

(d) Any railroad equipment repossessed by the administration, which is not leased to another railroad under the provisions of the act, and which is not purchased for stockpiling purposes by a department or agency of the the U.S. Government, shall thereupon promptly be sold and disposed of by the administration under such terms and with such guaranties as will assure that the said equipment shall be scrapped and not used by any railroad.

Among other provisions of H.R. 2078, the ICC would be directed to report to the new agency at least once a year on the supply and demand for railroad equipment. Rail equipment owned by the new agency would be subject to applicable provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act and to the exercise of jurisdiction by the ICC, with the agency required to file copies of all leases of equipment with the Commission.

A fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both, is provided for anyone making any false statement for the purpose of influencing the rail administration or for obtaining money, property, a lease of real equipment, or anything else of value.

Terms of the members of the Railroad Equipment Board, aside from the three Government officials, would be 6 years. The Board would be directed to hold at least four meetings a year. The members would receive $100 a day when actually engaged in the performance of their duties as such. An executive director would be appointed by the Board itself, but the bill does not specify what his salary would be.

Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that most of the railroads of the Nation are faced with serious financial problems. As a matter of fact, the future of some of the eastern railroads is in jeopardy. The program provided for in my bill, H.R. 2078, is badly needed, and I hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will schedule early hearings on the legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hebrews 10: 22: *Let us draw near unto God with a true heart in full assurance of faith.*

Most merciful God, at this noon hour, we are again entering the sacred retreat of prayer and approaching Thy throne of grace where none has ever been repelled or sent away without Thy needed blessing.

May our minds and hearts be the shrines and sanctuaries of Thy love and gird us with the spirit of humility and devotion as we strive to build the highway toward peace and good will.

Show us how we may dispel our doubts and fears by the expulsive power of a strong faith and teach us the wisdom of yielding our wills to the promptings and persuasions of Thy divine spirit.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 127, Rept. No. 1), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 127

Resolved, That during the Eighty-seventh Congress the Committee on Rules shall be composed of fifteen members.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 109

That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, January 30, 1961, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

THE STORY OF AN INDUSTRY, A UNION, AND A LAW

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, today I had an opportunity to join with other Members of Congress from the New England States and representatives of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, at a breakfast meeting held in the Congressional Hotel. The purpose of this get-together was to urge participation by the Members of Congress in the program of this textile trade union and to avail these leaders in the trade organization an opportunity to discuss with us their legislative aims in the 1961 session of Congress.

We were informed that the matters that interested the textile labor unions included an increase in the Federal minimum wage, area redevelopment, medical care for the aged, aid to education, adequate housing and tariff, and related problems affecting the welfare of textile workers and the economy of the communities in which these textile industries are located.

Each one of us was presented with a special so-called "white paper" which the Textile Workers Union of America had prepared and which was addressed to the Congress on the subject of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Landrum-Griffin Law, and the abuses heaped upon labor by the present National Labor Relations Board as presently set up.

From the various speakers that addressed our meeting, I am thoroughly satisfied that there is an immediate need for a congressional committee to be set up to investigate and review the policy, the workings, and the decisions of that Board. I am hopeful that such a committee will have an opportunity to investigate this Board that evidently leans heavily to the side of the employer and management instead of rendering fair and reasonable decisions.

So that the Congress may be afforded an opportunity to know more about this situation that was so vitally brought to our attention by the 1951 report of the Subcommittee on Labor Management Relations of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to include their "white paper" document entitled "Almost Unbelievable—The Story of an Industry, a Union, and a Law":

This is the story of 14 stormy years in the life of America's oldest industry, textiles, one of the Nation's most responsible trade union organizations, the Textile Workers Union of America, and one of the most controversial and least understood laws of the land, the Taft-Hartley Act.

Although it has been temporarily elbowed aside by the Landrum-Griffin Act, a law even more sweeping in scope, Taft-Hartley continues to be a colossus which stands in

the way of American workers seeking to organize in unions of their own, free choice.

As matters now stand, we merely have an opinion of Landrum-Griffin. We believe it to be evil in conception and destructive to labor in purpose; we believe it will be ruthless in its application and discriminatory and excessive in its penalties; we are dubious of its constitutionality. But all our fears and suspicions must await the verdict of future history.

Taft-Hartley, on the other hand, has been tried and tested. It has been challenged in the courts. It has been applied to countless industrial disputes. It has been hailed and assailed, glorified and vilified, analyzed, criticized, and memorized. It has made its own history. The evidence is in.

This is the story of Taft-Hartley, as it relates to the sprawling textile industry. At the same time, it is a story of how the members of the National Labor Relations Board—political appointees and not elected representatives—have amended that law, in all but the most literal sense, through "administrative interpretations"; and how, unchallenged and unchecked, these very same men have usurped powers which the Congress of the United States never intended them to have.

The Taft-Hartley Act declares it to be the policy of the United States "to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection."

Textile workers have lived under this law for well over a decade. Has it been good or bad for them? Has the right of free association in unions of their own choice been protected or abridged? Has the law stabilized labor-management relations? Has it contributed to a climate of fairplay? Has it been wisely and impartially applied and administered? Has it hindered or hurt the bona fide union of textile workers? Have the owners of textile empires, particularly in the South, had their enormous powers curtailed by this law, or have they further entrenched themselves?

This story will provide the answers to these and other questions. It will show that the interpretation and administration of the Taft-Hartley Act, for all practical purposes, has deprived the American textile worker of his right to organize—unless he is willing to risk all-out economic reprisal and even physical punishment. It will explain why a Senate Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations has called the situation in the southern textile industry "almost unbelievable."

It is a story prepared with a restraint difficult to maintain in the supercharged atmosphere in which it has unfolded. It is a simple story told without embellishment. It is a factual story, the hardest of all to relate.

We invite your attention to it. We trust you will read it through. We earnestly solicit your frank comment.

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO,
WM. POLLOCK,
General President.
JOHN CHUPKA,
General Secretary-Treasurer.

THE INDUSTRY

The textile industry is one of mankind's oldest. It is basic; man must be clothed.

Certainly it is the oldest form of manufacturing in America. The first settlers cleared the forests, planted fruits and vegetables, and hunted game to feed themselves; but someone had to build and operate a loom to provide clothing. Man can feed himself off the land, but he must manufacture clothing.

The history of the textile industry is as grim as it is long. Callousness and brutality have hovered over the mills since the first yarn was spun into cloth. Even today, in an era of a supposedly enlightened attitude of man toward man, the industry is still the lair of violence and contempt for human rights. This is not to brand all textile employers. Many are fair, progressive, responsible, and farsighted. But the charge of widespread cruelty is not an idle one made for dramatic effect. We shall document this allegation fully.

Down through the years, the chief characteristic of this industry has been its individualism, a tradition that even now prevents it from making the sweeping social progress that has marked the growth of nearly all other big business in America.

And make no mistake about it: the textile industry is big business today. With 7,950 separate establishments spread across the land, with almost 900,000 production workers turning out material at the highest rate of productivity in history, and with total national sales of $13 billion, it is more than just a basic industry; it is a giant industry.

It has been moving through changes in its structure so fundamental that today a handful of mammoth chains dominate the field. Burlington Industries, Inc., giant of the textile giants, has over 100 U.S. plants employing some 50,000 workers. Other large chains include J. P. Stevens with 31,000 employees; Cannon, 25,000; Lowenstein, Dan River and Deering, Milliken, with 17,000 each; Abney-Erwin, 16,000, and Cone, 15,000.

Some 20 textile companies reached such proportions that they are listed in Fortune magazine's directory of the 500 largest U.S. industrial corporations. They seem to have the outward characteristics of other large companies on the American industrial scene; yet their old individualism sets them apart.

Practically all segments of big business today recognize and deal with trade union organizations representing their employees. Some of them may do it grudgingly; some may do it voluntarily; nearly all of them do it.

The sole exception is the textile industry. Individualistic to the core though it is, the industry nonetheless has developed a concerted front in one area: stubborn and often vicious resistance to unionization of its workers. In the marketplace millowners may snarl at one another but they are united, for all their individualism, in opposition to unions.

This is especially true in the South, now the heart of the industry. More than 80 percent of the cotton industry, the major subdivision of textiles, is now located below the Mason-Dixon line. The movement from the North, where the industry was born, is intensifying. More and more new plants dot the southern countryside. And more and more of the technological improvements are being made in southern mills. The future of textiles is in the South, just as the future of the South may well be in textiles.

The economic stakes are enormous. Low wage rates and substandard working conditions for their employees have always given southern employers an unfair competitive edge over northern employers whose workers are more widely unionized.

Southern textile employers, in particular, do not intend to sit back and watch that advantage disappear or narrow. They see in unionization of their mills a steady lessening of that margin of extra profit. The ferocity of their historic opposition to unions is explained to a large degree by this factor.

Until 1947 there were encouraging indications that unionization would take root among southern textile workers. Success was slow but steady. The passage of the Wagner Act had stiffened the courage of textile workers. They felt that the prestige and power of the Government was behind them in their efforts to join unions of their own choice to improve their working conditions. The Textile Workers Union of America won 58 percent of the representation elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board in the 5 years prior to Taft-Hartley.

From 1947 on—with the passage and implementation of the Taft-Hartley law—that tide turned. Additional weapons were placed in the hands of the employers. Countless restrictions and obstacles faced the workers and their union. The climate changed to one of extreme hostility toward unions and this, in turn, aggravated the normal fear and apprehensions of the textile workers. Where unionization had been on the upgrade, it was first stopped in its tracks and then pushed downward. The TWUA lost 63 percent of all representation elections in the 5 years immediately following Taft-Hartley. Where the once untrammeled power of the employers had been checked to some degree, it again was given free rein.

In the 5 years prior to Taft-Hartley, successful and continuing collective bargaining relationships were established in 116 of the 150 plants where elections were won by the union. In other words, in 77 percent of the situations that developed, some foundation for ultimately harmonious labor relations was established.

In the 5 years immediately following passage of Taft-Hartley, the picture changed drastically. In that period the union was able to win but 56 representation elections. In only 24 instances was it possible to establish any sort of continuing relationships. The previous average of 77 percent was cut to 43 percent. In 18 percent of these cases initial contracts were signed, but the employers soon afterward refused to deal with the union. In 22 of these cases, or 39 percent, no contract was ever signed and the local unions involved were wiped out.

In simple terms, this meant that with the passage of Taft-Hartley union efforts were seriously throttled; more than half of the time the workers couldn't get a union even after they voted for it; and new organization was brought to a virtual standstill.

The decline in union strength and prestige has been more than matched by the enormous increase in employer power so that today, once again, the flag of feudalism flies above the Stars and Stripes in the textile strongholds of 16 Southern States.

THE UNION

Organizations, like people, often develop streaks of modesty. This is true even of trade unions which, in the past, seldom found time to blush in the midst of extravagant self-praise. Yet growth and responsibility have bred in TWUA the kind of humility which now makes it impossible for us to pat ourselves on the back. We are fortunate in that we do not have to do so; the history and activities of our organization have been commented upon frequently enough through the years by experts from outside the union ranks.

We herewith quote verbatim excerpts from a description of TWUA written by Alton Levy, a veteran reporter on labor affairs. For many years Mr. Levy was the close associate of Victor Riesel, nationally syndicated labor journalist, whose column appears in more

than 300 of the Nation's leading daily newspapers. This is what he wrote:

"In a sprawling, chaotic industry with a turbulent and chaotic history, the Textile Workers Union of America has achieved a unique distinction: it is here to stay. Therein lies perhaps its greatest strength and its greatest promise. At long last, here is a union to which the workers can look for assistance and guidance, and from which responsible elements in the industry's leadership can expect cooperation and sincerity in coping with the multiplicity of economic and social problems that have beset textiles through the years.

"TWUA is no stranger either to problems or struggles. It was born of both back in the surging thirties when it swept through the Nation's mill towns under the banner of the Textile Workers Organizing Committee, enrolling textile workers by the thousands in its crusade for better working conditions and better treatment. Other international unions already established in some phase of the garment end of the industry provided much of the early guidance and finances for the organizing drive that led to the formal creation, in 1939, of the TWUA as such.

"This union has been led from its inception by men of ability and responsibility who came up from the ranks with an intimate, firsthand knowledge of the mechanics and the economics of the industry. But just as they were part of textile, textile was part of them and to this very day this strong sense of identification has made possible enormous contributions by the union toward the stability and welfare of the industry.

"One can only marvel that this union has insisted on making its contribution to the development of the industry in the face of the vicious attacks launched against it and its members by important segments of the industry, especially in the South. One marvels at that and then is awed by the thought of how much more good this union could do if ever the textile industry learns—like all other big business—to recognize responsible, legitimate trade unionism, to deal with it, to cooperate with it for mutual benefit and to harness the ability, imagination, and knowledge of its leaders for the benefit of the industry per se.

"It is the measure of the TWUA that it is still prepared and willing to cooperate in this bold concept and still of the belief that the industry will ultimately see the errors of its ways.

"That TWUA is here to stay is apparent from the businesslike way in which it operates its farflung operations and the imaginative way it administers eight special departments that not only help run the day-to-day affairs of the union but plan new ways to better service its members, new ways to enroll new members and new ways of helping the responsible elements of the industry to improve production techniques and increase consumer demand for textile products. This latter effort will be sparked by the union's newly formed union label department.

"TWUA has 616 local unions and 50 joint boards serving the some 220,000 textile workers it represents across the land. It has 208 employees on its payroll, consisting of two general officers, 128 field representatives, 21 technical specialists, and 57 secretaries and clerical employees.

"TWUA has never had the slightest suspicion leveled against its officers and their conduct. It has been among the early opponents of corruption and wrongdoing within labor's ranks and was a strong supporter of the ouster of unethical unions from the AFL–CIO. Its most violent opponents have never hinted at wrongdoing and there has never been any investigation, informal or otherwise, of TWUA by any local, State, or Federal agency or committee.

"Of special interest is the carefully devised system of checks and balances employed by this union to safeguard its funds. This precautionary program, like TWUA's special ethical practices code, is so thorough that it goes far beyond the suggestions even of the AFL–CIO's ethical practices committee and the yardsticks proposed by various congressional committees.

"To insure that its affiliates are equally scrupulous in the handling of funds as is the national office, TWUA has issued a special manual for local and joint board auditing committees. In addition, it has developed a filmstrip to illustrate the instructions spelled out in the manual. Field audits are made periodically. Trained auditors are in the employ of the union and these specialists not only check the books and records of the various funds but even inspect leases, deeds, and other pertinent data relating to realty operations to insure that these are conducted on the highest ethical level as well.

"Matching its time-honored antiracketeering attitude is the TWUA's historic and vigorous anti-Communist position. Communists, like all totalitarians, are barred from holding office in the union. The union's officials are all active in anti-Communist organizations. When the old CIO expelled various Communist unions from its ranks, TWUA was among the ardent supporters of the then CIO president, Philip Murray, in his drive to keep the Nation's trade unions loyal to the traditions and precepts of America.

"While lunatic fringe groups will raise this issue from time to time in their virulent opposition to the union, particularly in the South, there is not a single responsible industry or community leader below the Mason-Dixon line—even among those who may be openly antiunion—who will level this charge seriously at the TWUA. Privately, even the smut groups concede that raising the 'Red' question is done only because it is sometimes effective, but that they know it isn't true about the TWUA."

This, then, is the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO—the second in the cast of characters of the story we are about to unfold.

THE LAW

The Taft-Hartley law, enacted in 1947, was described by its sponsors as a measure designed to restore balance to labor relations. The public, hit by a massive propaganda barrage directed by conservative political and industrial groups, was led to believe that labor had grown too strong and that the employers needed relief.

The Wagner Act, it was said, had been designed to strengthen the power of the unions. By encouraging the formation of unions and protecting workers in their selection of unions to represent them, we were told, this act played favorites. Presumably, the Taft-Hartley law would restore simplicity to the intricate push and pull of labor relations.

This was the "line" of the antiunion forces. Unfortunately, the public fell for this oversimplified, misleading and, in large measure, inaccurate picture of the labor relations situation in the country in 1947. Captivated by catch phrases, few studied the bill carefully. Few were aware of the dangerous precedents established in this vaguely worded statute. Few realized the menace contained in the many loopholes.

Even within the labor movement there was an unfortunate tendency to attack the new law violently in sweeping general terms like "slave labor" or "neo-Fascist," etc., while not properly evaluating the ugly uses to which skilled antilabor lawyers might put the so-called "fine print"—the less publicized, complicated sections of the bill that never received too much public attention.

After 14 years of experience with the Taft-Hartley law, it is apparent that, instead of balancing labor relations, it has destroyed all vestiges of equilibrium. Instead of imposing peace, it has revived and intensified industrial strife. Instead of bringing relief to the allegedly harassed employers, it has given them a new and heavier club to use against unions and has set up new legal forms to protect them in the indiscriminate wielding of this legislative bludgeon. Moreover, it has negated, for all practical purposes, the right of unorganized workers to join a union without fear of coercion, intimidation, and economic reprisal.

By amending many of the sections of the old Wagner Act, Taft-Hartley has hacked away at the very things that might have protected the right of workers to join unions of their choice. As TWUA declared in a presentation before a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

"The 'free speech' amendment under the Taft-Hartley Act and the National Labor Relations Board's interpretations have revoked every reasonable limitation that previously existed on employers' freedom to oppose unions. They are no longer subject to the Wagner Act Board's 'totality-of-conduct' doctrines in appraising their behavior. There are practically no effective prohibitions on individual interrogation, 'captive' audience addresses, or the use of coercive 'plant closing' prophecies.

"This unrestricted freedom to oppose unionism has been particularly fatal to union efforts in mill towns and rural textile communities, where workers have few alternative employment opportunities. Employers have fought unionism with threats of plant closing if the union wins an election, and with insidious propaganda labeling unions or their leaders as unsavory and associates of undesirable persons. These broadsides, which stamp all unionism with the misconduct of the few, are very common.

"Another increasingly common weapon against unionism has been the use of community agencies or other outsiders as fronts for hostile managements. Since Taft-Hartley does not concern itself with the conduct of third parties, they have complete license to fight unions with whatever means they wish. The Wagner Act had permitted the NLRB to reach out to third parties and thereby prevented such 'volunteer' union-busting activities from interfering with organization. But the Taft-Hartley Act stops the National Labor Relations Board from providing workers with such protection under the law. These outside groups have proved to be most coercive and have done much to terrorize union workers."

The framers of the Taft-Hartley law were very astute men. They knew that in their zeal to jam the law through the 79th Congress, while the carefully stirred up public anger at unions was at its height, they might inadvertently omit some necessary piece of restrictive legislation. So they prepared even for this eventuality by tucking in a provision that allows individual States to pass their own labor relations laws to supersede the Federal law if—and this is a mighty big if—the State laws were more restrictive.

The Southern States answered the call. In short order, most of the 16 States below the Mason-Dixon line rushed through their own so-called "little Taft-Hartleys," quaintly characterized as right-to-work laws. Whatever loopholes were left by the daddy of all antiunion laws were immediately plugged by these State laws. In the main, these State laws wipe out union security clauses in collective bargaining agreements and make extremely difficult the checkoff of union dues.

For all practical purposes, the combined impact of Taft-Hartley and the restrictive State laws has made successful union organizing impossible in the South. This is an ugly fact of which TWUA is more pain-

fully aware than most unions because almost all of its organizing activity has been in that area. In recent years TWUA has spent several million dollars on organization work in the South. TWUA is frank to admit that the few thousands of workers it enrolled were totally disproportionate to the time and effort and money spent. Yet the union's fight goes on even in the face of these frustrating odds, for to abandon the southern textile workers would be to acknowledge that 20th century labor-management relations cannot prevail over naked feudalism.

The spectacular lack of success this union and others have found in the South is attributable as much to the climate generated by Taft-Hartley and right-to-work laws as to the laws themselves. Where there was fear among southern workers before Taft-Hartley, there is total terror now. Where there was uncertainty—even under the Wagner Act—that the Government could or would protect workers against the millowners, there is no question in the minds of Dixie workers today that they have been abandoned by their Government and that the labor law of the land has given the employers carte blanche. Where once there were tangible signs of hope among southern textile workers, there is now obvious frustration, disillusionment, and despair.

Political appointees being what they are, it is not surprising that members of the National Labor Relations Board—designated by the same political party that fathered Taft-Hartley—should reflect this change in atmosphere.

Where complaints of unions and workers once were swiftly investigated and ruled on, there is now endless delay—delay which plays into the hands of the employers by giving them that much extra time in which further to coerce and intimidate workers seeking to enroll in a union.

Where once employers were hard put to stall certification elections, today the NLRB has made it easy for delay after delay. Indeed, the record is full of instances where the Board allowed so much delay that union strength disappeared by the time an election was ordered.

In a nutshell, the NLRB today—reflective of the climate generated by the Taft-Hartley law—is a biased body favoring employers and antiunion groups against workers seeking to unionize their plants. This is a serious charge to make but it is a charge we shall document fully, and the documentation is sufficient to justify a full congressional investigation of the NLRB.

Historians of tomorrow, seeking to pinpoint the pressures that beset workers of this era, may well single out not the specifics of the law but rather the antilabor climate it created.

There is no doubt in the minds of those who have had to live with the Taft-Hartley law, night and day, that the men who devised it and sponsored it were devilishly clever foes of trade unionism whose intent was to weaken or smash effective trade unionism. But the passage of time makes crystal clear the one-sidedness of this measure in content and application and raises the very serious and important possibility that the Members of the 79th Congress who voted for the bill were themselves victimized by the skilled schemers. In retrospect, it is hard to believe that a responsible body of lawmakers could or would have passed such an absurdly unbalanced measure if they had not had the intent misrepresented—deliberately and persuasively.

There is an urgent need to undo some of the damage created by the 79th Congress. The story we shall unfold on the following pages—told simply and documented fully—justifies another long, sober look at this law and justifies, too, immediate and deep-rooted changes to restore decency, sanity, and equity to labor relations in our great land.

PATTERN OF THINGS PAST—PATTERN OF THINGS TO COME

Henderson, N.C., has always been a small, sleepy, southern textile town. It is still a small southern textile town. But it is no longer sleepy. It is wide awake with smoldering resentments nourished at various times by dynamite blasts, gunfire, shouts, imprecations, fist fights, and even soldiers in battle dress carrying rifles with bayonets fixed.

Henderson, N.C., is a community split asunder by a strike none of the strikers and few of the townspeople really wanted. It is a community that is experiencing, firsthand, the sort of civil war that has divided scores of other southern textile towns in the past decade.

The full, ultimate, inevitable effects of Taft-Hartley have visited Henderson, N.C., pitting brother against sister, nephew against uncle, son against father, friend against friend. Hand in hand with this deterioration of personal relationships have come hunger, despair, privation, frustration, and unhappiness.

Yes; there's a strike in Henderson. It's a strike of more than 1,000 men and women—members of the Textile Workers Union of America. They have been out on strike, at this writing for more than 2 years.

They picket, day in and day out, before the gates of the Harriet and Henderson Cotton Mills where they had worked some 14 years under the protection of a collective bargaining agreement between their employer and Locals 578 and 584 of the TWUA.

Under the watchful eyes of heavily armed National Guardsmen dispatched to the scene by North Carolina's chief executive, these men and women have trudged back and forth in front of the plants' gates in a simple effort to preserve their jobs, their standards, their union, and their dignity.

Fourteen years with a union contract—and now this? Were the relations between union and management that bad? Was there a history of repeated strikes and stoppages? Was the union "arbitration-happy"—taking the firm before an impartial arbiter on any and all grievances?

To all of these questions the answer is a resounding "No!" Relations had been surprisingly amicable. From the time the union first began to organize in 1943, there were but two interruptions—a brief strike in 1951 and an equally short-lived stoppage in 1954. In the last 5 years only 11 grievances had to be referred to arbitration for settlement—an average of about 1 grievance per plant per year.

Yet, despite this history of seeming amity, there is a strike. There are pickets. There are strikebreakers. There has been violence. There may be more.

Why? Why?

The obvious facts, on the surface, tell us that although the local unions indicated willingness to continue the old contract, the company refused and said it wanted termination.

This action was coupled with company demands for contract changes. But, you may say, the firm certainly has a right to seek changes in a union contract.

Yes, it does, but the company sought changes in every single clause in the contract with the sole exception of one, relating to military service, and that's governed by Federal law binding on both sides. Most drastic of the changes sought by the company was the elimination of arbitration of unresolved grievances or differences.

It must be borne in mind that workers and employers had lived amicably and profitably for 14 years with a union contract which included the arbitration clause. The union asked no increase in wages, pensions, or fringe benefits and sought no improvements in the old contract. Still the company insisted on provoking the strike.

One can only conclude that the employer is not a completely free agent; that he is no longer making his own decisions; that the language and nature of the contract changes for which he asked came from others, elsewhere; and that this situation was deliberately created as part of a calculated conspiracy among southern textile operators to weaken and, if possible, destroy the trade unions freely selected by textile workers—specifically, the TWUA.

No other explanation makes sense. John D. Cooper, Jr., president of the Harriet & Henderson Cotton Mills, had never really been a vicious man in years past. His acceptance of the union led to 14 years of peace and profits for all concerned. The community-at-large benefited from the continuity of employment and the improved pay of the TWUA members in the plants.

All signs now indicate outside control of the situation—outside decisions Cooper cannot contest—outside direction of the tactics that have led to strikes, scabs, deep bitterness, and violence.

This is not to dismiss from consideration the peculiar personality of the man—a narrow-minded, sick, embittered old man whose shrill refusals to meet the moderate proposals of a conservative North Carolina Governor have unnecessarily prolonged the dispute and made a peaceful solution that much more difficult.

We are acutely aware of the complications that have arisen as a result of Cooper's quirks. We know that he has publicly announced that he is, "in principle," opposed to the concept of binding arbitration of unresolved issues between his company and the union. Yet we also know that Cooper, in fact, is an ardent champion of the principle of compulsory binding arbitration—in his commercial dealings. The records of the American Arbitration Association show that Cooper and his firms are among the most frequent users of arbitration when it comes to settling commercial disputes. All of this bitter old man's public protestations about arbitration, therefore, are of special concern to us, for we know this is a smokescreen that can serve only to stall an equitable settlement of this long drawn-out dispute.

We know that Cooper deliberately misled the union and Gov. Luther Hodges of North Carolina when a tentative agreement to settle the strike was reached on Friday, April 17, 1959, in Raleigh. At that time TWUA agreed to a "compromise" which eliminated the arbitration clause from the contract, eliminated the checkoff of dues and called for the rehiring of strikers for all immediately available jobs, with further rehiring on a seniority basis as soon as vacancies occurred. Everyone was given the clear impression that a substantial number of jobs were at once available to the strikers.

On the recommendation of the union, the strikers voted to accept these terms on Sunday, April 19, 1959. When they reported for work on Monday, April 20, in accordance with the settlement agreed upon in the Governor's office, the strikers found that "scabs" had been hired even for the jobs that were supposed to be kept open for the original employees on the second and third shifts. This "doublecross" upset the agreement and provoked a continuation of the strike.

Even the normally cautious and conservative Governor Hodges was appalled by this crass disregard of the terms of the settlement. He exploded in all of the southern papers with an attack on Cooper for "misleading" him and the union. But from that point on, the Governor retired to the sidelines.

However, proemployer State police authorities continued their strikebreaking efforts. Having failed to break the will of the

workers to resist, despite wholesale picketline arrests and the use of the National Guard, the State bureau of investigation arrested eight strike leaders, including a TWUA vice president, on June 13, 1959, and charged them with conspiracy to dynamite company property.

The eight men were tried in an atmosphere of antiunion hysteria and under circumstances that should trouble the consciences of Americans everywhere. They were speedily convicted on the testimony of an ex-convict in the hire of the SBI. The witness, incidentally, was a former TWUA member with a grudge against the union. The eight were subsequently sentenced to terms ranging between 2 and 10 years, and are now behind prison bars.

Let no one assume even for a moment that there is no realization on the part of TWUA of the enormous complications that have resulted from the almost unfathomable machinations of a rancor-ridden old man. We are painfully aware of how aggravating such personality problems can be. But the entire fight and the issues involved go much deeper than one man's irrationality.

Were John D. Cooper, Jr., a younger man today, less plagued by illness, loneliness, bitterness, and power lust, the strike would have been forced on the community anyway. Cooper's complex psychological structure makes settlement tougher, but his foibles didn't cause the strike. Henderson is not an isolated instance nor are the issues at stake peculiar to Henderson alone. Henderson is part of a pattern—a pattern dating back to 1947 when the Taft-Hartley law was passed.

There have been a hundred Hendersons throughout southern textile towns. The bitterness and violence, in one degree or another, have always been there. Even a congressional committee, which only superficially examined the southern textile industry, was appalled at the scope and ferocity of employer opposition to organization of trade unions by textile workers.

Henderson, we have said, is no isolated instance of antiunionism; it is a natural development of a pattern brought into existence by the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. It was inevitable.

These are strong allegations. Can they be substantiated? Do the demonstrable facts bear out our harsh indictment? Is there enough documented evidence to justify this sweeping characterization of developments in the textile industry below the Mason-Dixon line?

Step through the pages of the past decade's history with us. Take a long, objective look at the facts we have compiled. Consider the situations we have described calmly and dispassionately. And then, you be the judge.

But before we start our tour of a countryside littered with the residue of hundreds of bitter industrial explosions, read what a Senate subcommittee concluded after an examination of the southern textile industry's labor relations policies:

"In stopping a union organizing campaign, the employer will use some or all of the following methods: Surveillance of organizers and union adherents; propaganda through rumors, letters, news stories, advertisements, speeches to the employees; denial of free speech and assembly to the union; organization of the whole community for antiunion activity; labor espionage; discharges of union sympathizers; violence and gunplay; injunctions; the closing or moving of the mill; endless litigation before the NLRB and the courts, etc. If all this fails, the employer will try to stall, in slow succession, first the election, then the certification of the union and, finally, the negotiation of a contract. Few organizing campaigns survive this type of onslaught."

SURVEILLANCE OF ORGANIZERS AND UNION ADHERENTS

Charlottesville, Va., close to an historic shrine and the home of the author of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, was the backdrop for an example of company behavior that would, in the ordinary person's mind, be associated with a totalitarian state.

At Charlottesville stands the plant of Frank Ix & Sons Inc., a rayon throwing, knitting, and weaving mill. It had been in existence some 20 years. It had always paid substandard wages. Besides this, the then vice president and general manager of the firm, Frank Ix, Jr., had extensive real estate holdings, renting homes to many of his employees. In times of housing shortage, workers at his plant were often more fearful of being evicted than they were of being fired.

TWUA was asked by the workers to organize the plant in 1946. Within a few weeks after arriving at Charlottesville, the TWUA organizer was able to identify almost every one of the more than 30 Ix supervisors, including the superintendent and personnel manager. It was not difficult, for he saw their faces often. Upwards of 10 of these "boss men" (a southern worker's term for supervisors) trailed the organizer as he called upon the workers at their homes. The surveillance was not subtle. On the contrary, these supervisors went in groups, their cars forming a caravan trailing behind the organizer's automobile.

Almost invariably after the organizer had seen an Ix worker, either on the street or at his home, that employee was questioned by a foreman or some other official about what had been said during the conversation with the organizer. Even workers who had not actually spoken to the organizer were cornered and quizzed. The foreman would have noticed the organizer's car near a worker's home and would assume the organizer had come to his door. As it turned out in several instances, the organizer had parked his car in front of one place and then visited some other individual on whom he did not want suspicion fastened.

In TWUA's files is an affidavit that the Ix company tried to rent a room from a millworker whose home overlooked the place where the organizer roomed. Sometimes union committee meetings were held in his room by TWUA sympathizers. The foreman who tried to rent the room said flatly to the landlady that the company wanted to keep someone at this place of vantage at all times to record who went to the organizer's room and when. "We will pay you well for the room," he said. As it turned out, the woman refused to allow her premises to be used for labor espionage.

Elsewhere in the union's file on Ix you will find letter after letter and report after report made by workers who were pressured by the company to attend union meetings and report to manageemnt on what was said and done. In an effort to ease their consciences, many of the workers gave the union copies of the reports they handed in to the supervisors.

At one time, more than 700 Ix workers had signed union cards. Clearly, this is an indication that the workers wanted a union not only in order to better their wages and working conditions but to shrug off this blanket of inquisition and persecution. Yet by 1950, this brazen intimidation by surveillance had become so effective that the union had to withdraw from the situation, despite plaintive pleas from some of those workers who still clung wistfully to the hope of having a union. An election would have been fruitless. Too many of the workers had been too intimidated. At that point, they would have been afraid to vote for the union, even in a secret election.

The fear was compounded by the disappearance of any vestige of protection from the National Labor Relations Board. Late in 1948 the NLRB ordered the company to rehire five employees who had been fired for union activity and to give them nearly $4,000 in backpay. Within a matter of weeks, four of them had been fired again. The background of these firings was almost identical to that of the first occasion; yet, this time the regional NLRB office decided in 1949 that it could not discover sufficient evidence to go to a hearing and the new complaints brought by the workers and the union were dismissed.

For some time, the phones at TWUA's office would continue to ring with calls from Charlottesville workers pleading for the union to come to their assistance; but the discouragement of the many, plus the lack of protection offered by the NLRB, led TWUA to the heart-rending and reluctant conclusion that a campaign at Ix would end only in defeat and further humiliation and danger for those workers still bold enough to vote for a union.

How can such a thorough network of surveillance be thrown around a cluster of U.S. citizens? Read from the proceedings of the NLRB's decision in the case of *Bibb Manufacturing Co.* (82 NLRB 338) dated 1949:

"The town of Porterdale was incorporated under the laws of Georgia a number of years ago. However, despite this act of incorporation, Porterdale remains in effect a 'company' town. All of its property, excepting a railroad right-of-way and churches, which the respondent (i.e., the company) donated to the various religious congregations, is owned by the respondent. All of Porterdale's utilities and public services, excepting police protection and education, are controlled directly by the respondent. In this setting, the relationship between the respondent and the police department, as set forth below, establishes a significant pattern of conduct."

In effect, every city official of Porterdale was an employee of the company. The mayor was the "house agent" of the company and in charge of police. The city recorder was the company's paymaster and treasurer. The city's attorneys were the company's attorneys. How effectively these men wove a web of surveillance around the workers and the union's organizers was described by an NLRB trial examiner in an intermediate report in this case. In part, he wrote:

"From July 10, 1946 to August 10, 1946, or a few days thereafter, policemen of the town of Porterdale were assigned to and maintained a 24-hour a day surveillance over the activities of each and every organizer for the union while he was inside the city limits of Porterdale, as well as surveillance over the home of employee Walter Reynolds, which the organizers made their local headquarters in Porterdale and in which much of the union activity took place.

"By this 24-hour watch over the Reynolds' home the police were able to know when the organizers were in town and to follow or trail them throughout the town while they were calling upon employees of the respondent. As soon as the organizers left the house on foot or by vehicle, the police followed by police car. If two organizers started out together and then went separate ways, there would be a policeman following each of them. Everywhere the organizers went, the police were sure to follow. For at least the above period of time, there was a policeman within 60 to 75 feet of any organizer who was in Porterdale.

"The police, except for one new employee who was unable to secure a uniform due to the clothing shortage, were always in uniform. They utilized the regular police car or the chief's automobile, both well known as police cars to the approximately 3,200 in-

habitants of Porterdale. The police made no effort to conceal their activities, but in fact made their surveillance as open and public as possible. The police remained at times on public thoroughfares. They said nothing. As described by one witness, the police were always around 'sitting and staring.'

"A number of the employees were afraid to talk to the organizers upon discovering their police escorts. One employee left the union organizer to whom he was talking for the purpose of telling the police escort that he (the employee) had not joined the union. The organizer offered to confirm this statement to the policeman if he should doubt the employee's word."

To anyone acquainted with the South, Porterdale's size, civic setup, and dependence upon one well-entrenched and all-pervading employer is not unusual. It is not even the exception that tests the rule. It is the rule. In mill town after mill town, such surveillance is not only possible but usually begins almost as soon as any group of employees begins expressing a desire to seek remedy through a union and a responsive union organizer checks into the community. Certainly the files of TWUA bulge with reports, affidavits, and case histories to that effect. They have not been kept secret. They have been presented time after time to committees of Congress. They have been publicized in the columns of the union's publication, Textile Labor. They are still available to any Government agency interested enough to inquire.

This invasion of the privacy of a southern citizen is possible because of the Taft-Hartley Act's insistence that any person influencing or interfering with a worker's free and open choice of a collective bargaining agent must be proved to be a direct "agent" of the employer. Since the Taft-Hartley Act does not patrol the behavior of third parties, the door is open to any and all avenues of assistance an employer may find. In the South, his friends are legion.

An era ago, under the Wagner Act, the NLRB was guided by a totality-of-conduct doctrine that allowed it to reach out and restrain these volunteers, curbing the license with which they attacked or invaded the privacy of unions and their adherents by making the employer justly responsible for these excesses, committed either in his interest or on his behalf.

Still, in a generation that has become familiar in one way or another with the totalitarian techniques of unrestricted police, such as the Gestapo and the MVD, any reasoning, civilized observer cannot help but find distasteful the terror bred by surveillance. Man does not move forward by looking back over his shoulder in fear, or ducking his head to avoid eavesdroppers.

PROPAGANDA THROUGH RUMORS, LETTERS, NEWS STORIES, ADVERTISEMENTS, SPEECHES TO THE EMPLOYEES

Words are wonderful weapons for textile employers these days, thanks to the Taft-Hartley law and the political appointees of the National Labor Relations Board.

The chief reason employers try to delay Labor Board elections nowadays is to get more time in which to hammer their workers over the head with spoken or written words of coercion. Thanks to the NLRB, they get delays almost for the asking. And thanks to Taft-Hartley, there are wondrous new uses to which they can put words—creating fears among workers, inciting suspicion and violence against unionists and spreading rumors of plant closings, to mention just a few.

Under the Wagner Act, this was seldom possible. Under the Taft-Hartley law, it is seldom impossible.

No provision of the Wagner Act dealt specifically with employer free speech. No special rules were required. From the statement of workers' rights contained in section 7, and the prohibition against interfering with those rights, stated in section 8(1), proper restriction on employer expressions logically followed.

Under the Wagner Act, a threat of reprisal in the event the union won was an unfair labor practice. A threat that the plant would close down in the event the union won an election, or a threat to discharge employees because of union affiliation were all unlawful because they destroyed the employees' free choice of a bargaining representative.

Under the Wagner Act, the Board developed a totality-of-conduct doctrine designed to curb more subtle employer efforts to deprive workers of their rights. Under this doctrine, noncoercive language combined with coercive acts was seen as part of a pattern of coercion. The doctrine received the sanction of the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled in a utilities case in Virginia:

"But certainly conduct, though evidenced in part by speech, may amount in connection with other circumstances to coercion within the meaning of the act. If the total activities of an employer restrain or coerce his employees in their free choice, then those employees are entitled to the protection of the act. And in determining whether a course of conduct amounts to restraint or coercion, pressure exerted vocally by the employer may no more be disregarded than pressure exerted in other ways. For slight suggestions as to the employer's choice between unions may have telling effect among men who know the consequences of incurring that employer's strong displeasure."

Practically all of the reasonable limitations on employer expressions of views were set aside by the enactment of section 8(c) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which reads:

"The expressing of any views, argument or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of this act, if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit."

Section 8(c) did more than just wipe out limitations on the free speech of employers. It went much further. For one thing, it abolished all rules against captive audiences. Today, 8(c) stands as the only statute in Federal law which says that a man cannot be held legally liable for, or have used against him, statements and utterances made freely and publicly.

There isn't much doubt that this grants textile mill owners freedom of expression beyond any constitutional requirement. By virtue of this provision, and the way it has been interpreted by a Republican-controlled NLRB, employer expressions have been deemed legally noncoercive, when in fact they have bulldozed countless thousands of workers in their choice of a bargaining representative.

It has been held that when an employer threatened to close his plant if the union won an election, this was not a threat but merely a prediction and, therefore, legal. Nor is it any longer the rule that employer questioning of individual employees on union membership is in itself coercive. Today, the question and answer session must be accompanied by some other act in order to be a violation. An employer may tell his workers that even if the union wins a representation election, he will not recognize it. The Board didn't consider this a threat, but merely an expression of the employer's legal position.

The Board exonerated an owner who prohibited union solicitation and distribution on his premises while at the same time passing out antiunion literature. The Board's pro-employer bias was perfectly clear when it stated: "Management prerogative certainly extends far enough so as to permit an employer to make rules that do not bind himself."

Again, the Board pegged this decision on section 8(c), noting that the antiunion literature did not contain threats, promises or frightening statements.

The Board used section 8(c) to throw out the Wagner Board's totality-of-conduct doctrine. Now employer expressions are considered apart from their context. If the expressions themselves are lawful, then the Board does not regard as material any independent coercive conduct.

Section 8(c) also wiped out the prohibition against the captive audience. Some of the harmful effects of the captive audience address were lessened by the doctrine developed from a case involving a department store, Bonwit Teller. Under this rule, a boss could deliver a captive audience address, but a union had the right to reply. All of this was abolished by later decisions of the Republican-controlled NLRB. Now an owner may compel attendance at a meeting called to denounce a union, subject to certain limitations which do nothing to blunt the impact of his haranguing.

According to section 8(c), noncoercive language may not be used as evidence of an unfair labor practice. Some lawyers have contended this is unique in that it prohibits the use of language as evidence of the motive or the intention of some act.

While "free speech" for the millowner might have little or no effect in some other industry, in southern textile communities it usually gives him lethal effect. TWUA has given various Congressional committees example after example of hate and fear literature heaped upon workers during organizational campaigns.

One pamphlet depicted a Negro union leader with a white woman, above which was the caption—"Don't let your wife or daughter or sister be found in the same position."

Another described a Negro in a photograph as a CIO vice president, in charge of organizing workers "including the white employees."

A publication which calls the CIO carpetbaggers and cartoons a fight between management and labor, egged on by a Communist, carried an article listing the birthplaces of labor leaders and describing them as "foreign-born propagandists" who set themselves up as self-appointed dictators.

In the latter part of 1955, TWUA began a campaign at various southern plants of Burlington Industries, Inc., the country's largest textile chain. None of the plants of this company in the South are organized.

The union was met with a flood of literature designed to provoke race hate and other prejudices of the workers and direct them against the union. At the company's Steele Mill in Cordova, N.C., a one-page reprint of an article entitled "Total Mongrelization," from a sheet called the American Nationalist, published in Inglewood, Calif., was handed out. A picture with the text shows the former CIO president, Walter P. Reuther (identified as "Russian-loving"), presenting $75,000 to the NAACP president, Arthur Spingarn, "the Jew who has headed that troublemaking organization since 1939." The article urged "white Americans to take action if this Jew-inspired program for compulsory mongrelization is to be defeated."

At Burlington plants in Hurt and Altavista, Va., there was distributed a caricature of an inhuman carpetbagger with a long nose and drooping tongue, boasting: "The NAACP sent me down here to desegregate you trashy bastards!"

At the firm's Altavista weave mill, in August 1957, a newsletter entitled "The Dan Smoot Report," published in Dallas, Tex., was

handed out. It contained an article by one William P. Bersch, Jr., called an employee of the Kohler Co., in Kohler, Wis., which charges the UAW–CIO with wanton violence during a strike, and concludes with the question, "Is this America?"

The news article in the "Report on Civil Rights" denounced the then Attorney General's civil rights position "as an open insult to the whole southern part of the United States" and demands his attention to union violence. A third article in the report deals with communism, claiming "the Communists would have a labor union harass a company with strikes and outrageous demands until the company was on the verge of bankruptcy, and then the union would buy the company out."

Word-of-mouth use of the racial issue by Burlington supervisors was discovered during TWUA's campaign in a pattern strongly suggesting central direction. For example, on October 1, 1955, a supervisor called a worker into his office and, during the course of a 2-hour "brainwashing" session, told him: "Don't you know that the union is 100 percent for racial integration?"

At the Radford, Va., mill, workers were told by the plant manager that union leaders have given large sums of money to the NAACP. On April 4, 1956, employees at the Drakes Branch (Va.) mill were told that if the union got into the plant, white workers would have Negroes as shop stewards.

At Burlington's Peerless woolen mill in Rossville, Ga., clippings of especially provocative material from the Chattanooga Free Press were displayed. After the campaign started, copies of the Chatham Star-Tribune were sent to the houses of the Altavista finishing and Altavista weaving workers, including those who were not subscribers—a clear tipoff that the mailing list of workers had been supplied to the paper. Newspapers in areas near Burlington plants played the plant-closing theme, emphasizing that unionism could well mean the loss of jobs.

The Post Dispatch, published in Rockingham, N.C., carried an article in its issue of September 20, 1956, noting that the Darlington mill, in Darlington, S.C., closed after "the CIO won a bargaining election."

"And our Burlington chain may do just that if the CIO should wedge in on the Steele plant in Cordova. Been done elsewhere, and could happen at Cordova. Burlington is simply not going to operate even one unit under CIO control," the paper warned.

The May 9, 1957, editorial published in the Charlotte Gazette, Drakes Branch, Va., stated: "Citizens know that industry has sought to leave the labor unions behind them when they moved here and that if labor unions get a hold here that trouble might follow."

The May 17, 1956, issue of the Altavista (Va.) Journal said in an editorial that many plants have come South because of the strangling effects of the unions, and adds: "Did you ever stop to realize that Altavista could become a ghost town with empty, unpainted stores and homes, a town devoid of its present property?"

Southern millowners and their allies have apparently concluded that the twin theme of race hate and plant closing constitutes the most effective double-barreled verbal blast against union organization. It is demonstrably effective, for TWUA's campaign among several of Burlington's southern plants did not succeed in organizing any of them.

The distribution of anti-Semitic and anti-Negro propaganda during that Burlington campaign knocks into a cocked hat the notion that only in backwoods southern companies can such uncivilized conduct go on. The fact is that Burlington is the largest single textile company in the United States, employing approximately 50,000 workers in about 100 plants. It also has mills overseas. Its securities are sold publicly on the New York Stock Exchange; and at the end of a recent fiscal year, it showed sales of $671 million and total assets of $523 million.

The triggering of blind hatreds by racist rantings and the paralyzing fear of union affiliation produced by threats of plant closing could not possibly be excused under the concept of free speech. Any realistic analysis of the first amendment must withdraw constitutional protection from such written and verbal trash.

The Taft-Hartley Act itself immunizes employers from responsibility for use of the twin fear and hate themes. We have seen how predictions and prophecies of plant closing, for instance, became legal when the Board indulged in fantasies to ignore the fact that such statements are threats within the meaning of section 8(c).

Lawyers have argued that the bulk of racist material used against unions is not clearly threats within the meaning of this section of the law, but that ample grounds are available to set aside any election in which they appear. A case decided shortly after Taft-Hartley was enacted reaffirmed the idea that an election will be set aside if surrounding circumstances prevent employees from registering a free and untrammeled choice.

"Conduct that creates an atmosphere which renders improbable a free choice will sometimes warrant invalidating an election, even though that conduct may not constitute an unfair labor practice. An election can serve its true purpose only if the surrounding conditions enable employees to register a free and untrammeled choice for or against a bargaining representative. For this reason the Board has sometimes set elections aside in unconsolidated representation cases, in the absence of any charges or proof of unfair labor practice. When a record reveals conduct so glaring that it is almost certain to have impaired employees' freedom of choice, we have set an election aside and directed a new one."

Another early Taft-Hartley case made it perfectly clear that the free speech limitations the act imposes, of finding unfair labor practices, just can't be applied to expressions of views that interfere with freedom of choice in an election.

"Section 8(c) prevents the Board from treating as evidence of unfair labor practices any expression of views, arguments, or opinion which contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit. Section 8(c) does not, however, prevent the Board from finding in a representation case that an expression of views, whether or not protected by section 8(c) has, in fact, interfered with the employees' freedom of choice in an election, so as to require that such election be set aside."

Although the Board has flip-flopped between applying the unfair labor practice rules to conduct affecting the results of an election and recognizing interference in an election—even in the absence of unfair labor practices—it recently gave some hope that it was beginning to recognize that a free election can't be held while the race issue is being exploited. But a decision on May 5, 1958, killed any hope that the Board had realized how racial issues affect workers in rural southern areas.

An election was held November 8, 1957, at Sharney Hosiery Mills, Inc., in Madison, N.C. The union lost and filed objections based on the company's use of the race issue. The Board's regional director dismissed them. The union filed exceptions. In a supplemental decision issued on May 5, 1958, the Board dismissed these exceptions, noting that 2 weeks before the election the company mailed a letter to the workers stating that TWUA is strongly prointegration, that it submitted a prointegration brief to the U.S. Supreme Court, and that it is striving to bring about integration in every phase of American life; also that TWUA is a member of the AFL–CIO which, at its convention, contributed $75,000 to the NAACP.

TWUA asked that the election be set aside because the injection of the racial issue created an atmosphere of hate and bias. But the regional director again found that the company's letter contained no threats of reprisal or promise of benefit and didn't go beyond the bounds of preelection propaganda.

In sustaining the regional director's dismissal, the Board stated:

"The issue before us is a narrow one. The petitioner concedes that there were no threats or promises, and it is not suggested that the employer misrepresented the petitioner's position. We are asked, rather, to hold that the mere mention of the racial issue in an election campaign is per se improper and grounds for setting aside any and all elections where such might occur.

"We have not, in the past, attempted so to limit campaigning, but have relied on the good sense of the voters to evaluate the statements of the parties. We are satisfied that this is the better course and adhere to it in this case."

In a separate, concurring opinion, the Board chairman and a member stated:

"While under the special circumstances of this case we concur in the result reached by our colleagues, we again express our concern over the injection of the racial issue in any election."

But such expressions of "concern over the injection of the racial issue" don't deprive textile owners of the deadly race-issue weapon against unions. The devastating use to which "free speech" is put by owners in southern communities contrasts sharply with the denial of means of communication to unions in these same communities.

The difficulties of getting across the union's viewpoint were increased when the U.S. Supreme Court decided that an employer may bar union organizers from distributing union literature on company property. According to the principle of this case, union organizers are not entitled to distribute literature on a company's parking lot simply because a plant is located outside of a town, or because the employees live in widely scattered distances from the plant, and there are hazards—perhaps legal as well as physical—to distributing literature at the intersection of the highway and plant roadway.

So, while a union which organizes in rural southern communities is barred from spreading its message, southern textile employers have all the means of communication at their disposal and can project those devastating expressions of opinion, euphemistically called employer free speech.

Unless the verbal and written license Taft-Hartley hands to employers is checked, workers probably will never be free to express how they really feel about union affiliation. The evil against which the Wagner Act employer's speech rules were directed is as prevalent today in unorganized plants as when that statute was enacted.

The Wagner Act employer speech rules furthered the national policy of encouraging collective bargaining. Taft-Hartley free speech completely destroys it in many situations. A balance between employer and union strength requires the elimination of the right of the employer to coerce and intimidate workers verbally. This power is often misleadingly described as employer free speech. It is really employer license. A return to the principles established under the Wagner Act is overdue.

DENIAL OF FREE SPEECH AND ASSEMBLY TO THE UNION

If there is any single conviction shared by most Americans it is that, in this land, a man can have his say.

But a man who wants to join a union in the South, or an organizer who wants to broadcast his position to the public in Dixie, would smile wryly at the suggestion that he can be sure of being heard below the Mason-Dixon Line, especially since Taft-Hartley became a law of the land.

The advertising columns of most small newspapers (and textile mills are for the most part located in small towns in Dixie) are not usually available to TWUA; nor is radio time. News reports about union activities are, for the most part, either so terse as to be uninformative (if, indeed, the paper bothers to cover them at all), or so biased as to be utterly misleading. In the meantime, the editorial columns of the very newspapers that hamstring the union's efforts to present its viewpoint, often are most virulent in their condemnation of the union, its leaders and its policies.

The reverse side of the coin is that the textile employer finds all these media completely at his disposal, usually because he controls them by ownership, direct, or hidden, or because the mercantile life of the community depends upon his generosity.

In Kannapolis, N.C., in 1951, TWUA wanted to broadcast to the 25,000 or more textile workers employed in the 10 plants run by the Cannon interests, located within an 8-mile radius. The radio station there was WGTL, managed by Fred Whitley, a member by marriage of the Cannon family. When TWUA first requested time, it was flatly turned down. Whitley himself told the union's representatives that no time was available.

Union representatives told the station that they had a file of scripts that already had been broadcast over a score or more of southern radio stations and that these were the kind of programs they wished to put on the Kannapolis air. They offered to submit each script in advance and pledged to keep all material in good taste, free of libelous and scurrilous matter. WGTL still declined.

The union then called the matter to the attention of the Federal Communications Commission which, after some months, managed to arrange a discussion of the matter with the station's Washington counsel. Meantime, the union continued to write to WGTL, repeating the request for a chance to discuss the impasse. The letters, sent by registered mail, were returned unopened.

The argument of the station's attorney was that there was no labor controversy in Kannapolis; therefore, no need to permit TWUA a voice on the air. Yet, as he argued, the station daily devoted considerable amount of the time of its newscasts to the 1951 southern cotton strike (with much of the information slanted against the union). TWUA did not base its claim for time upon the accuracy or lack of it. It simply urged that the FCC enforce the regulations assuring a reasonably fair hearing to differing points of view.

In November 1951, the FCC reported Whitley had consented to meet with union spokesmen. But it was not until January 1952 that the meeting was arranged. Whitley finally presented a contract allowing the union to rent 15 minutes a week for 13 weeks. It did not allow "live" broadcasts; the scripts had to be submitted a week in advance and then transcribed. The charge to TWUA was higher than any the union had ever paid for comparable time on larger stations in larger cities. But the union signed the contract and complied.

Censorship of the scripts was immediate and unusual in its severity, whole sections being cut, often to the point of rendering the material incoherent. Still, the union advertised widely and continued the broadcasts. Then abruptly, on April 1, WGTL knocked the union off the air, claiming previous commitments.

The union again went to the FCC, arguing that most of the time "committed" was devoted to unsponsored drivel, and supported its contention with monitored full-day programs. The FCC claimed it was unable to move in the matter. While there had been a technical breach of contract, the union felt a civil suit would not bring an effective remedy. TWUA had simply been choked off the air.

"We realize the Taft-Hartley Act does not, by its written terms, give a warrant to local radio stations to stifle a reasonable but also free discussion of the pros and cons of trade unionism," TWUA said in a brief filed with a Senate committee. "We do say, however, that the Congress should legislate on the problem of labor-management relations with full knowledge of what actually goes on in a place like Kannopolis when a union attempts to avail itself of the ordinary media of communications, such as press and radio."

It is not unusual, either, for the union and its adherents in the South to be denied another basic freedom ostensibly guaranteed them in America—the right of free assembly.

In 1954, TWUA began an organizing campaign in Elkin, N.C., the site of the Chatham Manufacturing Co.'s large blanket mill. Nowhere in this town of 4,000 could the union find a place to rent in which to hold a meeting. First, the YMCA was denied them (the board of directors of the YMCA consisted of Chatham management personnel).

That was late in May. On July 2, the company closed the mill for a couple of hours and marched all employees to the YMCA, where Chatham officials loosed upon them a barrage of antiunion speeches. A union organizer who wanted to attend the meeting was barred at the door.

Next, the union tried to rent an empty movie theater. The owner refused. A second request was made and again rejected. Yet, within 4 months after TWUA began its Elkin campaign, the theater was being used by an antiunion committee to hold rallies.

Early in June the union secretly arranged with the Austin, N.C., school board to rent its closed school for a meeting. The school was 15 miles from Elkin and the meeting was not advertised until just the day before it was scheduled. Yet, over 500 turned out, many standing outside listening through the windows because they could not get into the jammed building. Enthusiasm swelled so high that a suggestion from the floor to hold another meeting the following Sunday was approved.

But the following day, C. B. Eller, Wilkes County superintendent of schools issued an order that the school could no longer be used for union meetings. Members of the Austin school board muttered they would resign in protest, but the doors of the building remained closed to TWUA. A few days later, an organizer tried to rent a school in Elkin. A school board member, Porter Carder, said he saw no reason why the empty building could not be used. He went with the organizer to see C. K. Osborne, the principal.

"Chatham contributes a sum of money each year to our school lunch program," he told the organizer. "Knowing how Chatham feels about the matter, I personally can't make a decision that might take away the children's lunch and milk program."

A committee went to another Wilkes County school at Benham, 12 miles from Elkin. The principal refused use of the building, adding he personally was opposed to a union at Chatham mill. A Yadkin County school at Jonesville was not available to the union, the school board said, because it did not wish to jeopardize the Chatham company's annual contribution to maintain the school auditorium and gymnasium.

Finally, use of the Yadkin County school at Boonville was contracted for, but the night before the meeting was to take place, the principal notified the union he was withdrawing permission. Some 300 workers who were thwarted by the Boonville closing met in over 100 degree heat in a wooded grove some 15 miles from Elkin. As they drove up to the meeting, their cars were stopped by police who examined every driver's license, explaining they were making a "road check."

A few days later, the owner of the Boonville theater turned down an offer from the Union to pay $100 for the use of his theater for one night. The reason, he said, was that he had been visited by Chatham officials who warned him that his business would suffer if he rented the hall to the union. He would not identify the company figures except as "top brass."

Attempts by Chatham workers who lived and paid taxes in nearby Surrey County to use the auditorium in their courthouse at Dobson, 20 miles from Elkin, were equally futile. At first, the county clerk said the proper authorities at Raleigh (the State capital), who would have to decide if the building could be used, were on vacation. After several weeks he told a delegation permission would have to await a county board meeting. The workers gave up.

Eventually, an unused, dilapidated building was found. Barely usable in the summer (the roof leaked) it was too uncomfortable in the winter. (The concrete floor refused to respond to heat from the single pot-bellied stove.) The building was too rundown to be used as an office and operators of the motel, where the organizers lodged, threatened eviction if their rooms were used for union business. During the entire campaign in Elkin, the union never did obtain office space, despite its offer to pay premium rentals.

It might prove of interest to some to note, in passing, that during the time the union was unable to find a place of assembly in Elkin, the chairman of the board of Chatham Manufacturing Co. was the late Thurmond Chatham, at that time a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Here again, only two examples have been cited. TWUA files are replete, however, with reproductions of newspaper stories in which the bias in reports of union activities and policies is not even thinly veiled. Similarly, instance after instance has been documented to show that the southern community, so often tied to one all-powerful textile employer by an economic square knot, is not a showplace of human and civil rights. The U.S. Supreme Court has so noted.

An unfair labor practice charge against the Stowe Spinning Co. of Belmont, N.C. was carried to the country's highest tribunal. Its decision in favor of TWUA in the case (336 U.S. 226, 227, 228) read in part:

"In sum, North Belmont is a company town. We mention nothing new when we notice that union organization in a company town must depend, even more than usual, on a hands-off attitude on the part of management. And it is clear that one of management's chief weapons, in attempting to stifle organization, is the denial of a place to meet. We cannot equate a company-dominated North Carolina mill town with the vast metropolitan centers where a number of halls are available within easy reach of prospective union members."

The contempt so openly shown by the southern textile owner for basic human freedoms explicitly guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution is another stern indictment of the moral as well as economic climate created by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Can a statute be healthful for a nation if it encourages the erosion of the foundation stones of political and civil liberty for any citizen anywhere?

ORGANIZATION OF THE WHOLE COMMUNITY FOR ANTIUNION ACTIVITY

High on the list of distinctions with which TWUA would be be more than happy to live without is the dubious honor of facing

more hostility from entire communities acting in the interests of the local employers than any other union in the country.

Credit where credit is due. Thanks to the Taft-Hartley law this kind of mob offensive against the union is more prevalent today than prior to 1947. This is not to say that the employer-dominated communities thought any more kindly of the union before; they didn't. But under the Wagner Act, all of the coercion, threats, beatings, kidnapings, rumors, falsehoods, and assorted antiunion activities carried on by local businessmen, elected authorities, ministers, newspapermen or others, could be pinned directly on the employer, who obviously stood to benefit if his employees were scared away from unionization.

Under the Wagner Act, the term "employer" was broadly defined as "any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly." This wide net caught and deterred third persons who technically had no legal tie with the employer but who were helping him with his union busting.

Taft-Hartley narrowed this definition sharply. Today you can't enjoin anyone from union-busting activities unless he is "acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly." This "agency" requirement gives legal immunity to all of the "volunteers" who just happen to show up in southern community after community whenever the union begins an organizational drive. They can now do all the dirty work for the employer without transgressing upon the law.

The records of TWUA, the NLRB and various congressional committees bulge with instances of mob or community activities or schemes by persons not in the direct employ of the millowners, which technically violated no law despite the fact that the only beneficiary was the employer who was seeking to smash his workers' efforts at unionization. Thus, in one instance, an employer was held not responsible when certain of his "loyal" employees kidnaped an organizer or when others engaged in espionage and surveillance of union sympathizers.

The technical gimmick that allowed the employer to go scot free was the finding by the NLRB that these employees were not supervisors and therefore not the employer's "agents." This ruling that nonsupervisory employees are not "agents" of the employer also allows them to spread threats of plant closings if the union wins or allows them to take part in any variation of union busting on the plant premises without casting any legal liability on the employer.

In Elkin, N.C., the Chatham Manufacturing Co. proved that an employer with the press. businessmen and clergy in his hip pocket can always kill off a union campaign. This town is a church-going community. Attacks on the union by practically all of the ministers were perhaps the single most effective weapon in Chatham's bag of tricks. Community leaders boasted that in 1954 Chatham had contributed more than $75,000 in gifts to the Elkin churches. This is a fantastic amount for a single donor to contribute in a town of that size. Small wonder that clergymen who had willingly accepted these disproportionate gifts sang the praises of the company so vociferously.

Don't think for one moment that the opportunistic publisher and editor of the Elkin Tribune allowed the churchmen to establish a monopoly on patting the backs of the owners of Chatham. Harvey Laffoon, the operator of this local paper, soon threw its columns and pages open to any and all diatribes against the union and its leaders. The attacks ranged from calling them racketeers to picturing them as Reds. Mr. Laffoon was not content with transforming his paper into a veritable house organ for the Chatham company. He also opened its pages to Militant Truth, one of the foulest of the hate sheets that circulate among southern communities, especially when a union campaign is on.

But Laffoon and the clergymen were not alone in their union-busting efforts. Local businessmen and professionals formed a citizens' committee to fight the union. The town's prominent persons spoke at anti-union rallies and broadcast over the local radio station. Among these dignitaries were: Mayor Atkinson of Elkin; Mayor Blackwood of nearby Jonesville; Laffoon, the Tribune's publisher; the Reverend Howard Ford, pastor, First Baptist Church of Elkin; the Reverend J. T. Reichard, pastor, First Methodist Church of Elkin; the Reverend Homer Bradley, pastor, First Baptist Church of Jonesville; Garland Johnson, president of the Elkin and Jonesville banks; Dr. V. W. Taylor, Elkin physician; Mrs. J. R. Johnson, wife of an Elkin surgeon, and Claude Farrell, local businessman and member of the State board of education.

Not for naught was the bank president in there pitching. He was especially helpful to the company by putting the squeeze on prounion Chatham workers by demanding payments on loans and other debts. Thanks to his efforts most storekeepers in town stopped credit to persons known to be prounion. Union adherents were listed as "poor risks" wherever they went to make purchases.

Needless to add, this cruel, community-wide pressure on the Chatham workers paid dividends for Chatham. When the NLRB election was finally held, the union lost.

The remarkable part of this whole episode is that, even in the face of this extraordinary coercion, 730 workers voted for the union. The night of the election, drink-crazed company supporters roamed the town in boisterous and obscene demonstrations, while in the ramshackle headquarters of the union, strong men wept in utter despair and frustration.

The next day—and for some time thereafter—active union supporters were fired from their jobs.

Thanks to the radio station owners, the newspaper publisher, the bank president, the physicians, the storekeepers, the racists, and the ministers in Elkin, Chatham had triumphed and benefited. But you couldn't pin a rap on any of them. For, you see, under the Taft-Hartley law definition, none of these union-busters were "agents" of Chatham. Just "volunteers."

Like the community leaders of Jackson, Ala., who, with equal zeal and equal success, battled the TWUA at Clark Mills, a subsidiary of Vanity Fair, in their sleepy town of 4,000 residents, some 70 miles north of Mobile.

The appearance of the union woke up the natives. Soon after it became apparent that the union campaign would be successful, the Jackson Chamber of Commerce took over the anti-TWUA battle. Nothing was left to chance. Every important storekeeper and professional was "organized" and each was given a specific assignment. Lists were carefully checked and a survey made of each and every business in town.

Thus, if a worker owed money to a grocer, it was the owner of that grocery store who visited that particular employee. If someone still had payments to make to the local car dealer, the dealer suddenly appeared at that worker's home. The same pattern extended to all others from furniture store owner to landlord to bank official. A high school principal was even drafted for duty and he made sudden visits to former pupils who just happened to be employees at Clark Mills. Even the manager of the local employment office was utilized.

All these nocturnal visitors made the same pitch—don't be unfair to Vanity Fair. If the union should win, ran the refrain, the mill would move away. This would be bad for business and bad for the good name of the community. To keep the mills in Jackson, all that was necessary was for the worker to sign a slip withdrawing from the union.

By some strange coincidence the chamber of commerce had such forms already prepared. When the nighttime siren songs failed, the chamber of commerce officials got tougher and more open in their anti-union activities. They would appear at the mill during working hours and call certain people away from their jobs in full view of their coworkers. The bulldozing by the businessmen was crude, but finally effective. The union drive was smashed.

So severe was the terror that most of the workers refused to talk even to NLRB investigators. The businessmen—most of them owners of stock in the building that Jackson had thoughtfully erected for Vanity Fair—violated no section of Taft-Hartley, for after all, according to this law they were not agents of the company in whose building they just happened to own stock. Just good neighbors.

Competition among such "volunteers" is keen. Some of them can't wait for plants to come to town or are champing at the bit if the union doesn't start a drive so they can graciously offer their unsolicited services to the employer, as was the case with the chamber of commerce in Wilson, N.C.

These enterprising volunteers conducted an industrial survey of their town as part of a pitch for new businesses to locate there. Many were the inducements offered, especially the community's wholehearted anti-unionism. On page 9 of a special brochure prepared in 1956, under the general heading, "Unions," the chamber of commerce relates that:

"There are only two unions in Wilson manufacturing plants. One is a company union affiliated with AFL Wagon and Body Workers and there is no local representation. The other union is * * * the FTW. This union is in the tobacco processing plants, which is a seasonal business lasting only 4 months. Its members are 100 percent Negroes, mostly Negro women.

"In Wilson County unions affect less than 3 percent of the total working force. Our working people are from 100 percent American stock, from rural areas, used to hard work and, for the most part, are independent. The majority of workers are between the ages of 20 and 40 and most of them have secondary education. This accounts for the lack of enthusiasm for unionization.

"The chamber will actively fight any attempt by union organizers to bring a union into the local industries. A smaller city like Wilson has the advantage of combating unionization if requested to do so."

Give these boys credit for initiative and ambition. They've volunteered in advance to do the dirty work involved in fighting unions. Should they induce a plant to come to Wilson and should there be an effort by a union to enroll the workers, like the Chatham "volunteers" and Jackson's "good neighbors," these fellows will be in there pitching. If the law remains unchanged, neither they nor the employer who will benefit from their activities will be guilty of a violation.

The simple fact is that Taft-Hartley's narrow and legalistic definition of an employer is inconsistent with the act's purpose of encouraging a free choice in the selection of a bargaining representative. All persons who interfere in any way with this free choice should be deterred and the employer held liable for their conduct—not only the agents but any who act "in the interest of the employer," as was the case under the Wagner Act.

DISCHARGES OF UNION SYMPATHIZERS

Nothing is certain but death and taxes—and the firing of union sympathizers from

jobs in southern textile mills as soon as an organizing drive is launched by TWUA.

From the day in 1939 that the TWUA was formally set up as an international union, it has been established that sympathetic southern textile workers have been fired in every single organizing situation.

The reason for the wholesale dismissals is obvious. It weakens the union which, under the politically-appointed NLRB of the Taft-Hartley era, can rarely get anyone to investigate discharge cases speedily or fully. By the time the Board can be prevailed upon to act, some kind of action, union support has dissolved to such a degree that TWUA either loses the election or has to withdraw from the situation. The records of the union and of the various southern offices of the NLRB are loaded with evidence, fully documented, of the scope and regularity of this terror tactic.

At Belcraft Chenilles, Inc., in Dalton, Ga., 35 active union supporters were dismissed soon after the union drive began. The NLRB dragged the case along for almost a full year before ordering the immediate reinstatement of just 4 of the 35 who had been fired.

At the Lawtex Corp. in Dalton, Ga., the same pattern developed. Twenty-four active unionists who, incidentally, were all parish members of the only church in town that supported the union, were dropped from their jobs. In this case, the NLRB refused to issue a single complaint for any of the 24 victims.

Forty-seven active union supporters were fired at General Latex & Chemical Corp., also in Dalton, Ga., after the company had provoked a strike of its employees by laying off seven union committee members. Despite the fact that evidence proved anti-union animus sufficient to compel the NLRB to issue a cease and desist order, the Board would not order reinstatement or back pay. In the course of the NLRB proceedings, four workers were reinstated upon application. The remaining 43 never got their jobs back.

Rarely in the past 10 years under Taft-Hartley has the TWUA been able to process successful reinstatement of dismissed workers through the NLRB. But that is just one phase of the problem. In all too many instances the NLRB will refuse to accept the cases at all and they never are investigated by this Federal agency, let alone successfully adjusted.

Both aspects of the problem—the failure to win reinstatements and the failure in most cases to get a formal hearing—can be attributed to the climate engendered by the Taft-Hartley law. Under the atmosphere of the old Wagner Act, the NLRB was zealous in protecting the rights of workers, especially when firings took place. Complaints were followed up quickly. There was a minimum of stalling—even in the South—and there was a tangible feeling that the Board personnel wanted to help.

Today, procrastination is the byword. Little or not effort is made to establish the accuracy of union claims that particular workers were unfairly fired. The prevailing attitude is: OK. You prove it beyond all doubt; you dig up the evidence; you get the affidavits. Then, maybe we'll consider the case—as at the E. T. Barwick Co., also of Dalton, Ga., where five unionists were fired for their activities, or the Central Manufacturing Co. of Dalton, where two were dismissed.

In both these cases, the union's complaints got short shrift and the Board never made the slightest effort to investigate; curt letters indicated the refusal of the Board to issue a complaint or proceed otherwise with the cases. In the case of Blue Ridge Spread Co. of Dalton, it took the Board more than 5 months to decide that firings of two union adherents should be dismissed for insufficient evidence.

The situations briefly referred to above were all part of a special survey made of the dismissal problem in a single year in an area covering just 16 textile mills. In that single year—in those 16 plants—there were 200 workers fired for what was clearly union activity, ranging from signing cards, to attending meetings, to signing up other workers, to being committee members, and to standing at the plant gates distributing union literature. Of the 200 workers involved, only 14 were ordered reinstated by the National Labor Relations Board. In 9 of the 16 actions filed, the Board either dismissed the cases or refused to hear them at all.

It would be an impossible task to calculate the number of textile workers fired in the South for union activity. TWUA is constantly organizing in all of the 16 Southern States. And from the very first day it appeared at a plant back in the thirties, it has never had a single experience that didn't find workers being dismissed for their involvement with the union.

Firings in one-mill towns inevitably spread fear which invariably mounts as the firings increase. In most cases this fear, plus the many other pressures brought to bear on textile workers by the employer and his stooges in the community, is sufficient to weaken or destroy the union's campaigns. But one of the more ugly manifestations of this technique—and one which strikes even greater terror in the hearts of workers—is the firing which, in turn, leads to eviction from company-owned homes. And this, too, has been a common practice in all parts of the South where TWUA made inroads.

Pacific Mills owns the village of Rhodiss, N.C. When TWUA began to organize the employees there, Pacific ordered the chief of police of Rhodiss, who just happened to be in its employ as a plant guard, to keep all union meetings and active adherents under strict surveillance. This was done. Soon there were discharges and finally a union committeeman, who had personally signed up 50 Pacific workers for the union, was fired and then evicted from his mill village home. The NLRB trial examiner in this case was moved to report that:

"I believe the respondent's plan to rid itself of Hamby (the active union man who had signed 50 people) included not only his separation from the payroll but separation from the right to occupy the company house. Not only was it calculated to impress on Hamby, but also to impress on all others employed by the respondent and living in company-owned homes, the disastrous effects of engaging in union activities."

The eviction technique is an old one in the South. It has been used not only to weaken union organizing efforts but to smash strikes. It is a naked and almost indecent display of feudalism in the textile industry and is but one more weapon in the arsenal used by millowners to keep their workers from being unionized.

VIOLENCE AND GUNPLAY

Alexander City might be considered a typical southern cotton mill town. It is isolated in an essentially agricultural county, distant from the industrial areas of Alabama.

Politically and economically it is dominated by one force, the Russell Manufacturing Co., and one family, the Russell family. The mayor 10 years ago was Thomas C. Russell, uncle of Thomas D. Russell, president of three cotton mills owned by the Russell family. The mayor's name appeared on the company letterhead as treasurer. He owned the principal bank. The Russell company owned the hotel and the town water supply. The firm's other holdings included a woodworking plant, a grist mill and a creamery * * * about the only other sources of employment for those of the town's 16,000 citizens who didn't trudge to the cotton mill to work every day.

An organizer for TWUA paid the town a visit to see his father who had lived there for some years and had quietly acquired a reputation as a respectable and responsible citizen. The organizer himself was not unknown. He had been born and raised in that part of Alabama.

His visit originally was personal, but he soon became aware of the discontent among the cotton millworkers. With the permission of his director, he returned to Alexander City, registered at the hotel and invited friends of his who worked at the mill to talk over the task of forming a union.

Before any formal campaign was underway, the organizer was called to city hall by the chief of police, G. Mack Horton, who told the TWUA staff member to "get the hell out of town" or expect to be "mobbed." Horton intimated he could be influential in getting the organizer drafted into the armed services. The organizer was not too impressed; threats are commonplace in the life of a union organizer and he was on leave from the Merchant Marine, after having served in combat areas.

Surveillance of the organizer's day-to-day activities began soon. For months, two members of the police force, Alfonso Alford and Floyd Mann, followed the organizer. When he sat down in a restaurant, one or the other of them would also find a table. Whenever the organizer drove out to the mill village, the police car followed. He could not talk to a soul in town out of view of either of these men. Still, he collected signatures on TWUA cards. Something more drastic evidently had to be done.

It was. In plain daylight. Right in the middle of town.

The organizer was assaulted without a word by two thugs who "worked" in the cotton mill. He was beaten in sight of a uniformed police officer, Alford, who stood within 10 feet of the fight and shouted abuse at the organizer while he was smashed in the face until he bled, had his head rapped on the pavement and was kicked in the ribs as he lay in the gutter.

A soldier walking down the street made a move to intervene, but Alford insisted that no one "interfere." The officer also shouted to the 20 or so shopkeepers witnessing the slugging that he would "make cash bond for anyone who beat up a union organizer."

The organizer staggered to his feet as Chief Horton drove up to the scene. Horton bundled the organizer and the two worker-thugs into his car and took them to city hall. The workers he dismissed, telling them to return to the mill. The organizer he arrested, without making a formal charge. The local representative of the Veterans' Administration, who heard of the beating, came to city hall and put up bail for the organizer.

Horton refused to issue a warrant against the two men who had beaten the organizer. A few days later, the organizer returned to Alexander City with an out-of-town lawyer who tried to have the local justice of the peace issue a warrant against the assailants. Finally, the justice did issue a warrant and later said that one of the two millworkers had been fined $25. Months later, when the case was presented to a grand jury, no action was taken.

Officer Alford, who had witnessed the beating and offered bail for the assailants, openly threatened on other occasions to kill anyone who joined the union. One of his favorite expressions, it was reported at an NLRB hearing, was:

"My gun will belch fire and smoke if I catch anyone joining."

Another TWUA organizer took oath that Alford threatened to shoot him if he remained in Alexander City.

Officer Mann apparently also was assigned to an intimidation detail. He found a veteran, Roy H. Boddie, then working in the

Russell mill, who agreed for $100 to pick a fight and beat up Ernest Willis, a union sympathizer. Boddie was given a job on a set of looms next to those Willis tended. But, after Boddie became acquainted with Willis, he refused to go through with his bargain. He quit the mill.

This bald recital of one case in one campaign in one town in one State out of the whole South may not have excited any reader, but within it lies a record of brutality, official perversion of justice, and callousness in law enforcement that should shock any decent citizen, whether or not he lives in the shadow of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The long sordid story of violence in the South since the Taft-Hartley Act became the law could—and does—go on and on. TWUA files are packed with documentation of Taft-Hartley inspired violence.

At Silvertown, Ga., a TWUA organizer who was directing a campaign at the B. F. Goodrich Co.'s Martha plant was beaten with a blackjack, slashed with a knife and ordered out of town under pain of death.

A woman organizer was kidnaped by armed antiunion employees of the American Thread Co.'s Tallapoosa, Ga., plant, and union members who were distributing leaflets at the plant gates were assaulted.

A grisly story was unfolded before the Senate subcommittee on labor-management relations at a hearing held in Morristown, Tenn., to inquire into the violence surrounding the calling of the State militia into a strike at American Enka Corp.

The sworn testimony reported here is that of Lonnie A. Warwick, an executive board member of a TWUA local at the plant. He had been arrested on a charge of violating an injunction. A State policeman, a deputy sheriff and a National Guardsman took Warwick and several others to jail. He was to be locked up. His sworn statement taken from the subcommittee transcript reads:

"Jailer Haskins says, 'Follow me.' I followed him to the back of the jail where you start down the steps. At the moment I turned my head. I heard something coming shuffling, and Sergeant Gilbert (a State policeman) threw out his foot and attempted to trip me. At that moment I grabbed the rail. When I grabbed the rail, he hit me on the right side with a blackjack. By that time Patrolman Chapman is up to me, and he laid my scalp open with another blackjack here. By that time Tommy Sams (another State policeman) was on the scene. He hit me three times with a blackjack. I am on the first landing then.

"Then jailer Haskins used his key ring on my arm. Then he proceeded to hit me in the kidneys here with a pistol butt. I went down then, and they kicked me down the three or four remaining steps, and I was bleeding very freely. And they kicked me the remainder, or the length of the jail, into the jail cell, and left me there for 2 hours without medical attention. They did come every once in a while and look in.

"So, after about 2 hours, a man came into my cell with a briefcase, stated he was a doctor, and asked me how I received my injury. Of course, the National Guard and Haskins was there, so I told him I had no statement to make. So he did give me just a brief examination and walked out.

"So in a few minutes—"

Mr. Cooley (committee counsel): "Do you know who this man was?"

Mr. Warwick: "It turned out to be Dr. Davis. He was a physician. So, in a few minutes, Sergeant Gilbert, Sams and Chapman and Jailer Haskins came into the cell and told me to get up off the bunk, of which it took me some few minutes to get, so I could get straight so I could get up. I was in great pain. So then they made me walk upstairs without any assistance."

Warwick's narrative continued with another incident at Dr. Davis' office.

"There the blood was washed off me by the nurse. Then there was some pictures taken. Then I was taken into the X-ray room and, with a lot of trouble, they finally got me to lay on the X-ray table. Then there was a commotion and I asked the National Guardsman what had happened. He said that they had beat Switzer (a TWUA representative) up and taken him to jail. And my attorney, they had knocked him out; but he was a damn good man, he had come to already. And they locked him up."

Dr. Davis, according to Warwick, said the beaten man belonged in a hospital. Presently, Warwick continued:

"So in some 5 minutes, or something, I was helped by National Guardsmen off the X-ray table, put into the car with National Guardsmen, Sergeant Gilbert, and a State police officer. I was pushed over and in great pain, and there was three National Guardsmen in the back seat of the car with me.

"Sgt. Carl Gilbert started to cussing me. One young National Guardsman, with fuzz on his face about half an inch long, threatened to knock my teeth down my throat or knock them out with a club. I was then taken for a ride to Nabor's Clinic."

Bitter and distasteful as these stories are, they do not tell in themselves the deeper tragedy of violence. That must be inferred by the reader—the reader who realizes that the deeper tragedy left behind by violence is not the bleeding skin, broken bones and scars left on the bodies of the victims, deplorable as these may be.

The ultimate tragedy of violence is that it reflects a breakdown of law and order, a return to the code of fang and claw, another retreat instead of an advance for mankind in its struggle to go forward. These incidents—but a handful taken at random from TWUA files—demonstrate dismally that the Taft-Hartley Act, especially in its effect in the South, has become a blueprint for violence and a dark monument to brutality.

THE CLOSING OR MOVING OF THE MILL

Fear inspiring as violence is, there is still another horizon almost as bleak to the southern textile worker. That is the specter of unemployment.

Because so large a proportion of this basic American industry is still unorganized, its wage scales are woefully behind those of the other major manufacturing occupations. The textile worker almost never piles up a financial backlog in Dixie. If his standard of living is more than from hand to mouth, it is almost invariably because more than one member of his family tends the loom or doffs the spindle.

For that reason, when violence fails to halt an organizing drive or does not stop the flow of signed membership cards into the union office, the southern millowner threatens to, or actually padlocks his factory and leaves poverty in the mill village. Even more, his departure may, and very often does, splinter the economic spine of the community. Darlington, S.C., can testify to that.

In 1956, Darlington Manufacturing Co. was the main source of revenue for this town, providing about one-third of the community purchasing power. A modern, efficient cotton mill operated by Deering, Milliken & Co., it gave over 500 workers an income. To be sure, the income was modest for the wage scales were low; but the mill was at least a steady source of rent and grocery money. Working conditions were deplorable by comparison with standards TWUA has been able to secure in mills it has organized.

For that reason, the workers at Darlington wanted a union. They wanted it so desperately that they survived the burden of surveillance, brainwashing, and scorn heaped upon them by management and the conservative elements of the community. They went to the NLRB poll and they voted to have TWUA become their bargaining agent. That was in September.

Seven days after the election Darlington's board of directors announced they would recommend liquidation of the mill at a special meeting of the stockholders called for October 17.

That meeting was held and, in a brief 30 minutes, the economic artery of the community was gashed and left to drain. The man with the lancet was Roger Milliken, young but conservative, quiet but arrogant scion of an aristocratic New England family. He had taken over control of a chain of more than 30 textile mills several years before on the death of his stately father, Gerrish Milliken.

Roger Milliken himself owned 110,000 of the 150,000 shares of stock in Darlington Manufacturing Co. When he announced his decision, the mill's fate was sealed. This was underlined by the fact that the press release announcing the liquidation of the mill was mimeographed before the brief meeting was held.

By the following December the mill and its fixtures were put on the auction block. Within a matter of a few months some 200 of the 500 or more workers who had run the machines for Milliken had left the community in search of work elsewhere. The city's leaders were frantic in their search for some other firm to come to Darlington to occupy the brick structure that once had been the economic lifeblood of the town.

Immediately the newspapers of the area leaped upon the terrible consequences of Milliken's callous indifference to the fate of Darlington. But rather than denounce this cold financier who had left them stranded, they blamed the closing upon the handful of textile workers who had simply wanted a fairer share of economic security and had dared to vote for a union in order to obtain it. To the press and the business community, the liquidation of Darlington Manufacturing served as a bitter lesson—not to management, but to workers. It was made out to be a crime committed by unionism, not by management.

The NLRB, at the instigation of TWUA, held a hearing, now that Darlington Manufacturing Co. was a corpse. The examiner reported that nothing could be done to bring the owner, Roger Milliken, to book. Still, TWUA has not given up the fight over Darlington. It cannot, for this flagrant case of a runaway mill is an example to other textile managements who care little for their workers and less for their social responsibility to the community that supplies their labor.

Among the gestures that TWUA has made to attract public and Government attention to the plight of the town of Darlington was to send a delegation of the mill's workers to Washington to picket the office of the NLRB. Their placards were to the point. One read, "NLRB, Are Bosses' Voices All You Can Hear?" Another asked, "While the NLRB Stalls, How Can We Eat and How Can We Live?"

A TWUA representative who accompanied the group to Washington reported that one worker paused as they passed the statue of "Justice." She stared at the monument and then turned to her companion and said:

"It makes me wonder whether that blindfold was supplied by a southern textile millowner, and I'm ready to believe that if you could rip off that blindfold, we'd find 'Justice' winking one of her eyes at us."

Roger Milliken was not the first such runaway employer TWUA has dealt with. Chances are he will not be the last, unless something is done to make the National Labor Relations Act and the agency that administers it strong enough to stand up to managerial arrogance.

Even the Taft-Hartley Act says, "Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations * * *." Instances such as the Darlington liquidation to avoid unionization makes a mockery of what is supposedly a guarantee to workers of their right freely to choose a union.

Remedies must be found if the principle of collective bargaining is to be maintained, if management is to be held socially responsible, and if free choice is still to be the right of the men who make the Nation's cloth.

THE EMPLOYERS WILL TRY TO STALL

First dawdle, delay, and defer. Then postpone, protract, and prolong. Take one step forward and two steps backward, then hedge, haggle, and hinder. That's the way to do the big stall. That's the way to waltz around workers while their efforts at self-organization are kicked to pieces in the courts and before the National Labor Relations Board.

Southern textile millowners were taught these steps in a hurry by a small band of crafty lawyers. And they learned fast, especially since the accompaniment of the Taft-Hartley law made the whole routine simple.

And they can change partners easily without missing a step. If they aren't following Taft-Hartley, then they can take their lead from the "right-to-work" laws or from the politically appointed and politically biased members of the NLRB.

This "never-do-today-what-can-be-put-off-till-tomorrow" philosophy has paid real dividends for southern textile employers. It has stopped effective organization in its tracks. It has wiped out established local unions of textile workers. It has prevented certification of the Textile Workers Union of America as bargaining agent for workers, even after NLRB election victories; and it has made impossible the culmination of collective bargaining in signed contracts.

The southern stall has more varieties than Heinz has condiments. And in all instances the purpose is the same—to squeeze out extra time in which to terrorize employees, spread rumors, fire union adherents, channel community pressure on all who sign union cards and, in many cases, to evict union followers from company-owned homes. Under Taft-Hartley and under the new administrative rulings of the politically appointed NLRB members, getting delay after delay is easy. In most cases the employers are accommodated merely for the asking—even when the request is not made in writing, as required by the law.

In other cases the millowners—or, to be more exact, their sly legal experts—display a remarkable ingenuity in finding new ways of stalling for extra time in which to frighten off union sympathizers.

Like the owners of Cherokee Textile Mills in Sevierville, Tenn., where the TWUA petitioned for an NLRB election on October 9, 1956, with a clear-cut majority of the workers signed up. Two days later the company distributed large posters through the plant warning employees against union activity. While this pressure was being exerted, supervisors undertook a systematic questioning of all suspected union adherents.

Two weeks later the NLRB announced that a hearing on the union's petition for an election would be held on November 14. On November 1, the Board indicated that the employer had been granted a postponement of a week, since the president of the company said he couldn't attend the scheduled hearing because he had a date with a customer.

The union notified the Board at once of the terror tactics that had been launched in the plant and pointed out that the delay served only to allow the employer that much more time for intimidation of unionists in his employ.

It took 6 weeks to get to the first hearing and it is significant that the president of the firm, A. G. Heinsohn, Jr., who was too busy to attend the original hearing, did not say a word throughout the hearing. Neither did his local attorney, M. W. Egerton. Instead, the company's case was presented by Whiteford S. Blakeney, mastermind of much of the employer opposition to TWUA in the South.

Blakeney killed time at this and subsequent hearings by deliberately demanding that certain plant employees be included in the voting and bargaining unit even though these categories are specifically barred by the law. By making formal demand, however, he forced the hearing officer to file a formal report to the NLRB which, in turn, had to issue a formal finding.

Cherokee wanted the head nurse at the plant, its mechanical negineer, its draftsman in charge of machine research, its laboratory technician and all of the watchmen included in the production and maintenance unit for which TWUA had petitioned.

But fearful that this might not win a lengthy enough stall, Blakeney demanded that the vice president in charge of fabric research also be included in the unit. And to top even that, he insisted that the pilot of the company-owned airplane be placed in the very same unit.

The case dragged on and on. The company's ridiculous demands were rejected and an election was finally ordered. The intimidation and brainwashing of union adherents had been thorough and effective, however, in the months that elapsed. TWUA lost by a vote of 2 to 1.

At the Valdese Manufacturing Co. in Valdese, N.C., the same pattern developed. The union signed up a majority. An election was sought. The company asked for and secured several delays. Many months elapsed between the TWUA petition and the date of election.

During these months, the company spread fear and intimidation. Its pressure paid off again, thanks to the extra time so generously given to the employer by the NLRB—over the protests of the union and despite the fact that the company had not made its requests for postponements in accordance with the requirements of the law. TWUA lost the election and the Valdese employees once again were at the mercy of the company, with no protection of any kind against reprisals.

There are scores of cases for which TWUA has documentation where this technique of stalling is invoked to gain precious time for the employer—time in which to frighten off union adherents and hack away at union strength in the mills. And the representatives of the National Labor Relations Board, strangely responsive to the rising antiunion climate generated by the Taft-Hartley law, the right-to-work laws, conveniently put no obstacles in the path of southern textile millowners when they seek delay after delay, postponement after postponement, or when they use the most brazen and obvious subterfuges in order to stall cases.

The following report from TWUA southern staff member, whose sole activity is the processing of cases before the NLRB, pinpoints the pattern:

"Invariably the employer appears at the hearing with his attorney, or a special labor consultant, or both, and proceeds to stall. When he no longer can get delays he starts to 'build a case' by means of voluminous proceedings based on demands that he and his advisers know are out of order and will not be upheld by the Board in the end. But what care they? They will have gained valuable time.

"As a general rule, every classification in the plant is developed and argued extensively at the hearings. In most cases the employer and his representatives distort the facts about supervisory employees, clerical and office workers, and others who are not normally included in the production and maintenance unit. It thus becomes necessary for union attorneys to engage in long cross-examination in order to prove that these employees are ineligible to be included in the voting and bargaining unit. But even this is complicated by the obviously coached evasiveness of the company witnesses.

"This is done in plants of all sizes. In the smaller plants it enables the employers to win inordinate delays. In the larger plants, with more numerous classifications about which to argue, the delays are even greater. But small or large, the pattern is the same.

"Here again, as in the case of all other types of antiunion activities, the conduct of the employers is so much of a piece, so identical in character that it becomes quite evident that a highly efficient and carefully coordinated conspiracy to prevent collective bargaining exists in the textile industry in the South. Same actions, same language, same chronology and—usually, the same lawyers and labor consultants."

Credit the southern textile owners with flexibility. When they weren't able to kill off the union during the first phase of stalling prior to an NLRB election, or prior to actual certification, they swung into action with the second stage of their guided muscles. For to these employers, certification merely marks the beginning of a new phase in the warfare, a phase directed by high-powered, high-priced barristers.

Scratch a union-busting southern textile owner and you find a man who sanctimoniously claims to believe in the principle of collective bargaining and who boasts that he never refused to sit down with the union if it was certified to represent his employees. This is technically true; but since the law does not compel the completion of an agreement, the southern millowner and his advisers go through the motions, secure in the fact that their good faith will not be attacked by the NLRB and quietly exultant and confident that the dreary, drawnout haggling and higgling will ultimately kill off the union in the plant.

It is discouraging to report that time has proved them to be right. The union lost 28 locals, all when employers went through the motions of negotiating but refused to make one move in the direction of honest dealings as a prelude to a contract.

The roster of lost locals in the files of TWUA, with the following, typical notations is a depressing tribute to the deadly effect of Taft-Hartley on southern unionism: "Lost decertification election," "Strike for renewal, lost," "Dropped after renewal negotiations failed," "Dropped, 1953. No longer effective bargaining agent," "Strike for renewal lost," "Dropped, renewal negotiations stalled," "Dropped, negotiations fruitless," "Lost strike after renewal negotiations broke down," "Lost members. No renewal obtainable," "Lost strike for renewal," "Lost membership; couldn't get contract."

This file of frustration grows steadily. Talk of the monopoly of labor to TWUA field representatives and they will smile ruefully and silently hand you this organizational obituary in rebuttal.

Let's take a trip through some mill towns down South where they cotton to everything but union contracts.

There's Roanoke Mills Co., of Roanoke Rapids, N.C., where, in 1948, TWUA was certified as bargaining agent for the workers and the company agreed to negotiate. But the president of the firm, F. C. Williams, decided that his workers no longer wanted to be represented by the union despite the fact that they had voted for it in the secret election and despite the fact that the NLRB had finally certified it. Williams made no bones about this position and, in fact, told it to his employees in a letter in which he also

bragged that he was out to show that the union not only wasn't wanted by the workers, but would never get a contract with his company.

Despite this, Williams met with the union negotiators whenever he was requested to and even "bargained" over various contract proposals. After each negotiating session he would dash off a letter to the employees telling them what had happened—always stressing that one of the union demands was for a checkoff of dues. Williams insisted throughout the protracted bargaining that he would never agree to a decent seniority system, would never accept a proposed grievance procedure, would not agree to arbitration, would not grant any protections against unjust discharges, would not agree to checkoff of dues or a union security clause, and would not give any wage increases. To top that, he demanded that the union be held financially responsible for any unauthorized strikes that might occur.

A full year went by with nothing accomplished. All during that time, Williams was piling on the pressure in the plant. At the end of a year a group of loyal employees filed decertification proceedings. An election was ordered; the union lost. The stall had worked once again.

When it comes to forcing workers to desert their union, southern textile millowners seem to operate on the theory that if at first they don't secede, try, try again. Aldora Mills of Barnesville, Ga., adopted that approach. It took half a decade of deceit and delay, but in the end they made it. The TWUA was smashed in the plant.

It all began here when the Taft-Hartley law was little more than a gleam in the eye of the National Association of Manufacturers. On August 18, 1945, the union filed for an election at Aldora. On April 8, 1946, the election was held and TWUA won. On April 23, 1946, the union was certified. On April 17, roughly a week before certification, the union, on the basis of having won the election, wrote to the company requesting that negotiations for a contract be started.

It took until August 27, 1946, to get the company to sit down at the first joint negotiating session. In that period, TWUA tried by letter, telegram and telephone to get the firm to talk contract on more than a dozen occasions. First the plant manager stalled. Then he passed the buck to the company attorney who killed more time. He finally passed the baton to the company's industrial relations director who followed the pattern of procrastination set by his colleagues.

The first bargaining session was of so callous a nature that even the NLRB was aghast. In commenting on this first meeting in a later decision involving this firm the Board pointed out that "The stenographic reports of the negotiating meetings received in evidence at the hearings are replete with statements by the respondent's counsel to the effect that he did not consider the union a representative of the employees, that he did not think there was a bona fide labor organization in existence * * * the respondent unlawfully refused to bargain with the union. * * * In addition, we find not only evidence of bad faith but also a per se violation of section 8(5) of the act in the respondent's studied derogation of the union's status as the bargaining representative of the employees. * * * In our opinion such behavior impugns the validity of Board certifications and evinces disdain for the orderly processes of collective bargaining. These delays and evasions * * * constitute, in our opinion, the antithesis of the good faith bargaining required by the statute. We find the respondent's unlawful refusal to bargain began with the first request for negotiations on April 17, 1946."

Following the first meeting, which even the NLRB found intolerable, there were 16 separate negotiating sessions in 7 months clear through to March 20, 1947. Needless to say, all of these sessions were fruitless in view of the company's stall.

Late in March 1947, the NLRB held a hearing following a formal complaint by the union. It took more than 2 months for the NLRB trial examiner's report to be issued. It took another 15 months before the NLRB ordered the firm to bargain with TWUA and to cease and desist from interfering with the employee's right to self-organization and, incidentally, to reinstate four active unionists who were unjustly discharged. Nothing happened. The company, by totally ignoring the NLRB, told it, in effect, to go to hell.

But, despair not, dear reader. Think not that justice was blind. No—just deaf and dumb. Only another year and a half passed before the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, enforced the order of the NLRB on March 20, 1950. Thus, exactly 4 years and 7 months from the time it all began, it ended.

No contract. No members. No union. Chalk up another one for the Big Stall.

These scattered samplings of stalling spell out a pattern that can be documented in detail by the TWUA. Hundreds upon hundreds of similar situations are described in reports, letters, and affidavits which we are prepared to furnish to any governmental group seriously seeking to study the effects of 14 years of Taft-Hartley upon southern workers and their unions.

Nor is it strange that the tactics used from plant to plant and from State to State are so similar. These are, for the most part, not isolated instances of union smashing. They are part of a shrewdly and carefully devised pattern evolved primarily by two highly successful lawyers for whom the loopholes of Taft-Hartley have proved to be a real bonanza.

So exact is the pattern that, in many instances, company demands or counterdemands upon the union are in identical language.

Notices on bulletin boards, letters to employees, circulars, ads in newspapers, and even lectures to captive audiences of workers turn up the same language.

The curiously concerted character of the counteroffensive against attempts of textile workers to form unions of their own free choice suggests almost a conspiracy to thwart self-organization and to subvert the law's guarantee of the right of workers to join unions. It certainly suggests that Congress should take more than a fleeting glance to determine whether all of the improper acts by southern textile employers are not, in fact, clear violations of the Federal statute.

THE REMEDY

You have just read the unadorned story of an industry, a union, and a law.

The industry, sprawling, profitable, and basic to the well-being of our Nation, operates as though it is not part of America's economic picture and as though this is not 1961. In the most literal sense of the word, the southern textile industry is feudalistic. Arrogant in its strength and immunity, it continues to gain strength from the lopsided labor law of the land which so blatantly favors employers over workers in its actual day-to-day operation as to violate the intent even of the Members of Congress who enacted it in 1947, in the mistaken belief that they were balancing labor-management relations.

The union—which prior to 1947 represented more than one-third of the textile workers and today represents less than a third, despite the passage of 14 years and the expenditure of $10 million—still carries on its crusade to bring 20th century labor-management relations to the dark corners of the South, where textile millowners rule supreme.

It is clear that, given a free choice and a fighting chance, textile workers will seek the benefits of decent, democratic trade unionism as practiced by the Textile Workers Union of America. In situation after situation, up to 50 percent of the workers in a given textile plant sign union cards and voice their desire to be represented by TWUA. There is no trouble, as a rule, getting the cards signed. The trouble starts after an election is sought. It is then that the real danger and the actual one-sidedness of the Taft-Hartley law become apparent.

The ramifications of the Taft-Hartley law have been illustrated by the true stories you have just read—stories that are still being reenacted at places like the Avondale mills in Sylacauga, Ala., the Olson Rug Co., in Chicago, Ill., Monroe Upholstering Co., in Baltimore, Md., and Danville Silk Co., in Danville, Pa.

There are literally hundreds of other cases, carefully documented, which cover similar situations. TWUA is ready to make all of these records available to any interested governmental agency.

Our files are open; the facts are there. Does any Federal agency or committee care to study them in detail?

Even a cursory examination of events in textile mills and villages in the South during the past 14 years of Taft-Hartley is shocking. A detailed congressional study of how this law has harmed workers and their unions while aiding and abetting employers is in order, not by a hastily designated subcommittee of an already overburdened parent committee, but by a new select committee with funds and trained personnel that will enable it to dig up facts and figures beyond what TWUA is prepared to make immediately available.

Such a congressional investigation of a basic industry and a basic law should also address itself to the serious question of whether a group of political appointees can be permitted to twist the law out of all recognition—indeed, to amend it, in effect—by capricious and biased administrative interpretations.

This is precisely what the members of the National Labor Relations Board have done to the Taft-Hartley law. Yet the NLRB has been allowed to subvert the law and usurp powers it was never intended to have and remain uninvestigated, unchallenged, and unchecked. This danger to the democratic concept is of as much concern to us as citizens as the effect of Taft-Hartley on organization of southern workers is to us as trade unionists.

Such an investigation by a select committee will do more than establish the truth or inaccuracy of the details we have presented in this story and the voluminous information in our files. What we have presented are facts, solid and incontrovertible; so we are not worried on that score.

Such a probe can, at this critical moment in the industrial life of our Nation, restore the faith of all Americans in the value and benefits of orderly, decent labor-management relations. It can prove to the world that ours is not a Government that seeks to enrich employers while enslaving or punishing workers. It can shatter the myth spread assiduously by Communists and other foes of the democratic structure in government that elected representatives aren't really interested in or capable of creating an atmosphere of fairness and equity.

Such a probe can, we believe, help the textile workers by restoring the governmental protection to which they are entitled. It can help the textile industry by eliminating obstructions to true stabilization. The Textile Workers Union of America would welcome such an intensive investigation of the industry, the union, and the law. We do not believe the leaders of the textile industry

should oppose it; they, too, should cooperate fully.

If, as southern textile millowners and their apologists insist, the workers want no part of unionism, such a congressional inquiry will make that apparent. If, as some prominent Washingtonians have charged in the past, TWUA is in bad repute among southern workers and, therefore, incapable of effectively organizing these employees under any circumstances, such a farflung probe will establish that, too.

We are ready and willing—indeed, anxious—to take our chances on such a thoroughgoing study of this phase of the industry in which we have operated over these many years.

The AFL–CIO, of which our union is a part, has urged the passage of several amendments to Taft-Hartley with which we are in full agreement. However, the unusual position we are in makes necessary our call for additional specific amendments to restore a semblance of sanity and stability to southern labor relations. For while we believe that every union and every worker has lost something because of the effect of the Taft-Hartley law and/or the climate it created, we know that of all the major industrial groups in the Nation, only the textile workers have lost nearly everything.

As an industrial citizen, the unorganized southern textile worker is back where he was in 1932; he has no rights at all. This condition is atypical; it is different from conditions prevailing in all other branches of American industry.

The southern section of the textile industry is an area where legitimate collective bargaining has not been accepted; where the union is struggling desperately to maintain life; where employers utilize any means, including the most horrendous violence, to smash the union before it takes steady steps toward maturity; where entire textile-geared communities are mobilized against the right of workers to organize; where employers play a kind of hide and seek with a hesitant Federal agency charged with the responsibility of removing obstructions to the rights of workers to form, join, and maintain trade unions of their own choice.

Barring a more dramatic and more fundamental approach to this problem of all Americans, particular amendments are essential—amendments that go somewhat beyond those suggested by the national office of the AFL–CIO.

The special nature of southern textile's labor relations headache was recognized by the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In its report to the 2d session of the 82d Congress in 1951, the committee stated:

"Self-organization and collective bargaining (in the southern textile industry) are steadily losing ground. The retreat of union organization is being compelled by employer campaigns on an areawide front. Much of this campaign is being conducted in shocking violation of the Labor-Management Relations Act and the National Labor Relations Board appears to be powerless to cope with the situation.

"The extent and effectiveness of this opposition in the southern textile industry are almost unbelievable."

In suggesting the following amendments to the Taft-Hartley law, the Textile Workers Union of America merely seeks to restore real balance to labor relations in America. We ask no special favors. We ask for the southern textile worker only that protection by law, in the pursuit of his right to self-organization, to which he is entitled.

We are not asking anyone to organize workers for us—least of all the Government. Given half the opportunity in a less terroristic climate, we are confident that we can win to our union the great mass of the underprivileged and underpaid southern textile workers. Enrolling these men and women in our ranks and protecting their standards and their interests is our responsibility—more than that, our primary basis for existence.

We have the money, the manpower and the know-how. We have the experience, the desire and the confidence. We will fulfill our function. We will bring to southern textile workers all of the benefits of honest, American trade unionism. That is our job and we will perform it. We want no one else to assume this obligation for us.

What we propose are five simple steps to sow in the South the seeds of sanity, sincerity and stability in labor-management relations. These are, in our view, minimum recommendations. We frankly do not believe they go far enough. They will not solve the problem. But they do represent movement in the right direction.

Nor will these amendments by themselves guarantee success in our organizing efforts. The nature of the southern textile industry is such that progress in unionization will be slow, hard and unspectacular. But at least the workers will have a fighting chance to win the benefits of bona fide unionism. And the union will have a degree of freedom in communicating with the workers and trying to convince them that membership in the Textile Workers Union of America is to their distinct advantage.

That's all the workers in southern textile mills seek—just a fighting chance to make a truly free choice about their future.

Ultimately, in our view, no piecemeal approach to this problem can prove effective. The textile industry is basic and unique. Its problems—in particular, its labor relations problem—are so radically different from those of other major industries in America as to justify a bold approach in an effort, not merely to protect the textile workers, but to safeguard the industry itself from its own shortsightedness, planlessness, outmoded production, research and distribution techniques, reckless competition, and unwillingness or inability to unite against external pressures such as mounting imports from Japan and other low-wage countries.

Toward this end, we favor the eventual introduction of a special act—following closely the form and substance of the Railway Labor Act—to govern this essential industry and guide it toward stability and further growth.

But for acutely needed, immediate relief in our industry, we urge the enactment of amendments to the Taft-Hartley law along the following lines:

1. Revocation of immunity given to employers under existing laws to coerce and intimidate employees under the guise of free speech; employers should be held responsible for their words in labor-management disputes to the same extent that others are held liable for the spoken word.

2. The rule of agency in the present law should be changed so that an employer can be held responsible for the unlawful anti-union conduct of those acting in his behalf or in his interest, and so that such agents shall also be held accountable.

3. Restore the right of the National Labor Relations Board to conduct prehearing elections on the basis of evidence presented by a union that it represents employees in a plant, as one step in the speeding up of all NLRB decisions. The interests of justice require speedy resolution of NLRB cases in weeks—not months or even years as is the common situation today.

4. Provide adequate penalties against employers who persistently and repeatedly commit unfair labor practices.

5. Repeal section 14b. The Federal Government should insure uniform laws in the labor relations field affecting interstate commerce so that different State courts and State legislatures will not continue the confusion of a veritable Tower of Babel and continue to be free to overrule Federal policy in this field.

Even though there is not enough background of experience at this writing, the difficulties which the Landrum-Griffin amendments add to Taft-Hartley are obvious in at least three respects.

The new law has the effect of forcing union members to work on struck goods even where the employer is willing, by contractual provision, to exempt them from such distasteful tasks.

It places severe restrictions upon organizational and unfair labor practice picketing, thus denying unions the right to protest against substandard conditions.

It also restricts the right of labor to advise the consuming public that merchants are selling struck goods.

Each of these provisions is inequitable and, in our opinion, cries out for amendment.

The story we have unfolded has been the same story from 1947 to 1961. The sequel to this story is in the hands of the men and women in Washington who make the laws that govern us.

The executive branch of the Government and every Member of both Houses of Congress have been presented with this book. We can only hope that what they have read will convince them that serious measures are essential to cope with this national scandal.

We hope, too, that the many readers of this book who are just ordinary folk wind up with a clearer picture of a phase of American life of which they were formerly unaware. If they then write to their own Congressmen, urging that some remedial action be taken and suggesting a comprehensive inquiry by a select committee, then literally hundreds of thousands of textile workers below the Mason-Dixon line will know that they are no longer the forgotten men and women of our generation.

REPLY TO AD IN WASHINGTON POST

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 2, a two-page ad appeared in the Washington Post petitioning the Members of this House to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Three hundred and twenty-seven persons signed the ad. A number of them have been identified as members of the Communist Party. A few dozen of them are notorious for the fact that, over a period of many years, they have unwaveringly promoted the line of Moscow and the Communist Party in this country.

As I read the charges made against the committee in the ad and attempted to analyze them, I could not help thinking of numerous propaganda charges I have read in the past which have been made against the United States by the Soviet Union. The ad had certain characteristics which are typical of Soviet anti-U.S. propaganda, the principal ones being these:

First. The accusations made are broad, sweeping and vague—so much so that it is difficult to determine precisely what actions they refer to. For this reason, as our representatives in the United

Nations and the officials of our information agencies have learned, the charges are difficult to answer briefly and concisely.

Second. The accusations are also completely without foundation, reminiscent of the "big lie" technique usually associated with Hitler but practiced by the Communists long before anyone ever heard of Hitler—and still used by them.

Third. The accusations are ostensibly based on idealistic, noble and democratic principles but are actually designed to put an end to policies or practices which hinder or frustrate the advance of communism.

As I read the text of the petition in this ad, and the five charges it made against the committee, I was also reminded of a statement made by Lenin many years ago—after he had been cited for slander before a party tribunal because he had used lies in attacking his adversaries. This is what he said on the occasion:

> The wording [of our press campaign against our political foe] is calculated to provoke in the reader hatred, disgust, contempt. * * * The phrasing must be calculated not to convince but to destroy the ranks [of the enemy]—not to correct the adversary's mistake, but to annihilate, to raze to the ground, his organization. This wording must really be of such a kind as to provoke the worst notions, the worst suspicions about the adversary; it must sow discord in the ranks of the proletariat and be the opposite of phrasing which would convince and correct.
>
> I am intentionally sowing discord in the ranks of * * * [the proletariat]. In regard to such political enemies I conducted at that time—and in case of a repetition or development of the split, I will always carry out—a fight of extermination.

The ad in the Washington Post was calculated to provoke in its readers "hatred, disgust, contempt" for the Committee on Un-American Activities, "to provoke the worst notions, the worst suspicions" about it—all with the purpose of bringing about its liquidation.

The most discouraging aspect of the ad was the fact that of the 327 signers, 69, or 21 percent, were clergymen and another 6 were lay leaders of religious organizations. In view of the Communists' proclaimed hatred of God and religion; of the unrelenting persecution of all religions carried on for many years by Communist regimes; and in view of the countless and unspeakable atrocities inflicted on believers in God by the Communists, I had hoped that the day might have arrived in this country when clergymen, at least, might refuse to join with known Communists in an enterprise of any kind. I was wrong. As I said a moment ago, 69 clergymen signed this lying, defamatory ad. Ten of them were bishops and another six were presidents or former presidents of theological schools.

There is only one charge against the committee in the ad that is all specific and can, therefore, be readily answered. The ad charges that:

> The committee has perverted and thereby imperiled the proper and necessary powers of the Congress to conduct investigations.

Tied in with this accusation is the charge, in the introductory text, that the Supreme Court in the Watkins case "made it clear that the committee has habitually misused its mandate in unconstitutional ways for political purposes; that it has become an agency for repression; that it has usurped the functions of the executive and judicial branches of our Government."

Both of these charges are outright lies. The only finding the Supreme Court made in the Watkins case, as the Court itself subsequently pointed out most explicitly in Barrenblatt, was that Watkins "had not been adequately apprised of the subject matter of the subcommittee's investigation or the pertinency thereto of the questions he refused to answer."

The Court did not find in Watkins that the committee's investigation had lacked a proper legislative purpose.

It did not find the committee had in any way exceeded its authority.

It did not find that the questions Watkins refused to answer were not pertinent to the committee inquiry.

It did not find that the committee "habitually" or in any other way misused its mandate; that it operated unconstitutionally in any sense; that it was repressive in any fashion, or that it had usurped the functions of the executive or judicial branches.

The Court's failure to make any such findings in Watkins is a complete refutation of the above charge in the ad, because the Court itself said in Watkins that the issue in the case was the "fundamental principles of the power of the Congress and the limitations upon that power."

Clearly, if the Committee on Un-American Activities had been guilty of unconstitutional procedures, the Court, in deciding a case that went to the fundamental principles of congressional committee power and the limitation upon that power, would have made a finding to such an effect. This, by its own wording in Barrenblatt, it did not do.

The Washington Post ad in referring to the committee, made another statement that is pertinent to this issue. It said:

> We are confident that only a return to constitutional procedures can protect us against subversion without at the same time subverting the very liberties we seek to protect.

But in the Barrenblatt case, in which the Court upheld the contempt conviction of a professor who had refused to answer committee questions, the Court again examined the question of the constitutionality of the committee's procedures. Summarizing the basic issue in the Barrenblatt case in its decision, the Court said:

> Once more the Court is required to resolve the conflict of constitutional claims of congressional power and of an individual's right to resist its exercise.

So in Barrenblatt again, the Court went to the issue of the constitutionality of the committee's procedures—and found that its actions were in no way violative of the Constitution.

There is, therefore, absolutely no judicial authority for the charge that the committee has used unconstitutional means or procedures. As a matter of fact, all judicial authority is to the opposite effect because on numerous occasions in recent years the committee's actions have been reviewed—and upheld—by numerous courts on all levels.

Obviously, there can be no "return to constitutional procedures" such as the ad demands unless there is first a deviation or departure from them. The implied accusation against the committee in this statement, in the face of the numerous judicial findings to the contrary, can be classified only as another lie.

The second numbered charge the ad made against the committee is as follows:

> The committee has helped discourage free study and inquiry in working for peace while the world is threatened with destruction.

Who threatens the world with destruction? The answer is common knowledge—the international Communist conspiracy, of which some of the ad signers are members and to which many of the other signers have given yeoman service for years.

It follows that, since it is international communism that threatens the world with destruction, the true workers for peace are those who impart factual knowledge of this evil force so that it can be better fought and, if possible, its threat to destroy the world eliminated.

Did the committee help discourage free study and inquiry in working for peace when last month it relased volume II of its "Facts on Communism" series—a work of over 350 pages on communism in the Soviet Union, from the time of Lenin to that of Khrushchev? This volume is largely the work of Dr. David J. Dallin, author and coauthor of over a dozen outstanding books on communism and the Soviet Union and a man who is recognized throughout this country—and in other lands as well—as a leading authority on communism, the Soviet Union and its foreign policy and internal affairs. This volume, moreover, does not represent merely the views or scholarship of Dr. Dallin. It is heavily documented with quotations from dozens of recognized scholars of many nations.

Volume I of "Facts on Communism" was released by the committee last year and dealt with the Communist ideology. This volume was largely the work of Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame, coauthor of "An Inquiry Into Soviet Mentality" and also a recognized authority in his field.

Was the committee discouraging "free study and inquiry in working for peace" when, last year, it also released volume I of "Selected Chronology of the World Communist Movement"—a work covering all major developments in the growth of world communism during the years 1818–1945? In the future, this chronology will be brought up through the year 1957. It was prepared by Dr. Joseph G. Whelan, analyst of Soviet and East European affairs of the Foreign Affairs Division, Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in consultation with Dr. Sergius Yakobson, senior specialist in Russian affairs for the Library's Legislative Reference Service, and the committee staff.

In 1956, the committee published a 5-volume, 2,000-page work, "The Communist Conspiracy." This series contained basic documents on Communist doctrine, aims, strategy, tactics, and objectives, not only as regards the Soviet Union but the United States and other nations of the world as well.

Was this an attempt to discourage free inquiry for peace?

Also, in 1956, the committee published a 2-volume, 900-page work entitled "Soviet Total War." Over 120 persons—educators, labor leaders, journalists, security officials such as J. Edgar Hoover and Allan W. Dulles, military and religious leaders—all of them authorities on one aspect or another of communism or the Soviet Union, contributed material to this series.

Was free inquiry and world peace endangered—or strengthened—by this action?

Can anyone honestly claim that the committee has discouraged free study in working for peace because it has published seven consultations on the "Crimes of Khrushchev"—the butcher of Budapest who is now dictator of the Communist world? Or because it has published 10 volumes, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, on the leaders of the Communist movement in the Soviet Union, Red China, and various satellites?

Has the committee discouraged free study for peace when it has published consultations with numerous authorities on communism covering such subjects as Communist psychological warfare, the Communist strategy of protracted conflict, Moscow's motivation in proposing summit conferences, the persecution of religion in Red China and North Korea, Communist use of language—and also trade—as a weapon?

Surely, it is obvious that such publications, by helping inform the Congress and the American people about the nature of their enemy, not only help preserve the peace but also promote further inquiry in the same or related fields by giving capable scholars recognition and an opportunity to impart their knowledge to many thousands of people who would not otherwise have the benefit of it.

In addition, of course, in thousands of pages of hearings held over the years, the committee has kept the Congress and the American people informed of shifting U.S. Communist Party strategy and tactics (which reflect Soviet directives) so that they may better cope with the Communist challenge both here and abroad while preserving the peace.

If it were true, as charged, that the committee discourages free inquiry and study in the cause of peace, would educators, journalists and clergymen such as the following be active supporters of, and cooperators with, the committee in its work?

Dr. George Loring Allen, University of Oregon; Dr. Stefan T. Possony, Georgetown University; Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé, director of the foreign policy research institute of the University of Pennsylvania; Prof. William C. McGovern, Northwestern University; Dr. Anthony T. Buscaren, Le Moyne College; Dr. James D. Atkinson, Georgetown University; Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, University of Notre Dame.

Also, Max Eastman, John C. Caldwell, Henry A. Kissinger, James Burnham, Eugene Lyons, Edward Hunter, Constantine Brown, Frederick Woltman, Ludwell Denny, Willard Edwards, Ralph deToledano, Dr. Charles W. Lowry, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Rabbi S. Andhil Fineberg, and Bishop Fulton Sheen.

Is it conceivable that men such as these, who have devoted their lives to working for peace and to free inquiry for that and other purposes, would support a committee that worked to the opposite purpose?

The truth about this charge in the Washington Post is that a great number of its signers fear free study and inquiry into communism and hate the House Committee on Un-American Activities because it promotes this type of activity. The only peace many of these people want is the peace of a global jail, which will be imposed on the world if Moscow succeeds in its aim of subjecting all peoples to its tyranny.

The next of the false charges made against the committee in this ad reads as follows:

> It has harassed Americans who work for racial equality and justice.

It is committee policy to subpena as witnesses only those who, sworn testimony, "reliable confidential information," or documentary evidence in its possession indicates, are presently or have recently been members of the Communist Party—except, of course, in hearings which indicate by their very nature that witnesses are not suspected of being Communists. Are the signers of the ad claiming that the Communists are the only ones in this country working for racial equality and justice?

I believe I know the type of committee activity that is referred to, in typical Communist smokescreen fashion, in this charge. In hearings on Communist activity among youth held last February, a young Negro who had recently broken with the Communist Party testified as follows before the committee:

> I went into the party with the idea that the Communist Party was the solution to the Negro people's problem, but as my experience in the Communist Party I find out that the Communist Party wasn't a party for the Negro people, that the Communist Party have one of the worse discriminations in their own party themselves.
>
> If the Communist Party can use the Negro people as a tool and use them for their own advantage, the Communist Party don't give a darn about the Negro people * * * and I also witnessed discrimination in the party. If something happened to the Negro people, the Communist Party finds out * * * the Government of this country changed things around and worked the things in the favor of the Negro people, it seems like the Communist Party they get sad and they want to drop the issue altogether. In other words, the Communist Party want to see the things really keep on happening to the Negro people so they can use this as a weapon to try to rally the masses of the Negro people around the Communist Party.

The testimony of this young man, Albert Gailard, was not the first such testimony given before and released by the committee—testimony of a kind which had revealed the duplicity of the Communist Party and its agents in claiming to work for racial equality and justice.

In 1954, the committee published a report "The American Negro in the Communist Party" which included the testimony of half a dozen Negroes who had held official positions in the Communist Party and who had broken with it—all of whom had testified that the Communist Party does all in its power to promote race hatred and tension, rather than racial equality, in the United States.

It is work such as this by the committee that inspires certain of the ad signers to use the "stop-thief" technique in trying to discredit the committee. They know that they themselves have been guilty of the false charges they make here. I defy each and every one of the signers—including the 103 learned professors and educators, as well as clergymen and bishops—to name one person the committee has harassed simply because he or she has worked for racial equality and justice.

Not content with this unfounded charge the signers of this lying ad made another related charge against the committee:

> It has increased bitterness between racial and religious groups of our citizens, which ir turn has imperiled our good relations with the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

I cannot conceive how any honest and informed clergymen or educator could make a charge such as this when committee activity in the racial and religious fields has been limited strictly to revealing the tactics of the Communist Party in deceiving and exploiting racial and religious minorities for its own ends—or in revealing Communist religious or racial persecution in furtherance of Moscow's aim of destroying all opposition to its goal of world conquest.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, in its publications and in the statements of its members in the course of various hearings, has consistently emphasized the fact that religion and the churches are the foundation of our opposition to communism and our strongest bulwark in fighting it.

At the same time, the committee has exposed certain Communists who have engaged in the most despicable of all forms of treachery—that of posing as clergymen in order to carry out the Communist design of perverting or destroying all religion—so that the triumph of Red totalitarianism will be guaranteed.

Does anyone in this House actually believe that this phase of the committee's activity has increased bitterness between religious groups in this country? Or that it has imperiled our relations with the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America—many of whom are deeply religious?

Not long ago the committee released a consultation with five Protestant leaders from Asia—clergymen and lay leaders—who gave details of the persecution of all religions in Red China and Communist North Korea and spelled out some of the revolting atrocities inflicted on the people of these countries by the Communists in their antireligious war.

Can anyone claim that, in doing this, the committee fomented bitterness between religious groups in this country—or that it imperiled U.S. relations with the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America?

The answer, obviously, is "No." This last quoted charge, too, is a lie.

The final charge made against the committee is as follows:

> It has discouraged social and cultural contacts with our neighbors on this shrinking planet. It has discouraged U.S. students and scholars from studying in countries which we Americans desperately need to understand.

In looking back over the committee's activities during the past year or so, I can think of only one of two things that this charge could refer to. Revealingly, when the charge is considered in the light of these committee actions, it places the signers of the ad on the side of the Kremlin and Red China, and against the United States.

Early last year the committee held hearings on Communist training operations, with a considerable part of them devoted to the seventh World Youth Festival which was held in Vienna in the summer of 1959 under Moscow's auspices, with the World Federation of Democratic Youth and International Union of Students serving as sponsors.

As the committee stated in its recently published annual report, an important reason for this hearing was:

> To consider the advisability of sending to future festivals, delegations which are versed in Communist tactics and accredited by the U.S. Government as true representatives of American youth.

In an effort to discover what really happened at Vienna, the committee called witnesses from both elements of the American group which went to the festival—the Communist faction and the anti-Communist faction.

The Communist witnesses uniformly invoked the fifth amendment and refused to answer all questions about their part in the festival. The anti-Communist witnesses, on the other hand, spoke freely and answered all questions to the best of their ability.

The hearings developed certain truths which all Americans—and particularly our youth, who are now the target of an intensified Communist agitation and propaganda drive—should know about certain social and cultural contacts referred to in the ad, truths, by the way, which the Communists do not want known.

The hearings revealed that the youth festival was rigged from beginning to end to serve Communist purposes; that the controlling personalities at the festival were not young people but old revolutionaries, skilled in methods of hoodwinking youth. They revealed that, although the Communists were very much a minority in the American delegation, they maneuvered control of the group initially and—when the anti-Communist young Americans tried to gain control in Vienna so that the group's actions and statements would reflect the anti-Communist sentiment of the great majority of its members—they were completely frustrated by the cunning operations of a Communist machine they were not prepared to cope with.

The hearings revealed that there was no free speech or expression for anti-Communists at the festival. They revealed that a former Nazi had a hand in controlling the Communist faction of the U.S. delegation. They revealed that the youth delegations from the Communist satellites were kept separate from the non-Communist youths and not permitted to mingle or speak freely with them.

Naturally, Moscow and the U.S. Communist Party did not like these hearings and the truth revealed in them. At the time of the hearings, the committee received 11 letters and cables from Communist-dominated youth organizations in as many foreign countries protesting the holding of the hearings.

Apparently, the signers are as unhappy about these hearings as the international Communist apparatus was.

There is another committee action which, I believe, the signers of the ad had in mind when they made the last quoted charge against the committee.

Last summer, the committee published a consultation it had held with Mr. Robert Loh, who was born in China and came to this country to complete his education. In 1949, after receiving his masters degree at the University of Wisconsin, Mr. Loh returned to mainland China—which had just fallen into Communist hands—at the request of a former professor.

After teaching there for 2 years and becoming thoroughly disillusioned with the Communist regime, Mr. Loh became a mill manager and "showcase capitalist" and receptionist-host for visiting foreigners in Shanghai while waiting for an opportunity to escape to freedom.

In his consultation with the committee, Mr. Loh revealed that the Red Chinese for years have been spending huge sums of money and organizing tens and even hundreds of thousands of their enslaved subjects in various ways to keep all visitors to that country from learning the truth about conditions there. He spelled out in detail the numerous, devious ruses used by the Communists to mislead and hoodwink visitors to Red China.

Red China, the committee knows from other hearings it has held, is now trying to get American students of Chinese ancestry to go there to study. I have no doubt but that, to use the phraseology of the ad in the Washington Post, the committee's publication of Mr. Loh's testimony discouraged young Americans of Chinese origin from studying in Red China and that it, combined with our hearings on the Communist Youth Festival in Vienna, has discouraged other Americans for certain types of social and cultural contacts with the Red Chinese.

At the same time, however, I also have no doubt but that these committee actions have helped inform the American Congress and people about certain countries which, as the ad says, "we Americans desperately need to understand."

Obviously, the Committee on Un-American Activities had done nothing to discourage social and cultural contact with Britain, France, Italy, Turkey, Mexico, or any other free nation in the world. It has done nothing to discourage scholars from studying in such countries. It has, however, done much to uncover the truth about the nature of, and the conditions in, those nations which are our enemies and are working unceasingly to destroy us.

This, it appears, is what the signers of the ad in the Washington Post do not like—and are determined to end—if they can possibly do so.

That the charges against the committee in the Washington Post ad are composed of falsehoods and distortions is obvious from the facts I have presented. There is also one other element of duplicity in the ad that I would like to refer to briefly before concluding my remarks.

The committee has already received word from one alleged signer of the ad—a lay religious leader—indicating that she was in some manner tricked into lending her name to the ad and saying she is "very sorry my name was used." In the case of at least one signer, it appears, the ad is also false, lying, and duplicitous.

I am pleased, of course, to know that the Members of this House—or at least the overwhelming majority of them—did not give the faintest consideration to the Communist-serving proposition that this body should give up the one continuing, formalized expression of its determination to fight the Communist enemies of freedom at every turn. This is without question a tribute not only to the Members of this House, but also to the people of America who have chosen them as their Representatives.

I have also been most pleased, of course, to note the weakness of the effort to destroy the committee. Certain elements worked long and hard for this ad. But what they wound up with was not very much. First, they had to resort to distortion and falsehood in attempting to make a case against the committee. Then, out of the estimated 107 million adults in this Nation, they could produce only 326 persons, at the most, who were deemed prominent enough to sign their ad. To get this number, moreover, they had to descend to the traitorous level of Communist Party membership in some cases and, in many others, to the not much higher level of the confirmed Communist fellow traveler.

This certainly puts in an unenviable position those signers of the ad—particularly the clergymen, professors and other so-called intellectuals—who are neither Communists nor fellow travelers. They are indeed in strange company. I cannot help wondering just what they would do if placed under oath and asked to produce evidence to substantiate the charges against the committee to which they have affixed their names.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES FOR DISABLED WORKERS IN GOING TO AND FROM WORK

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill which would provide an income tax deduction for expenses, up to a total of $600 a year, that are incurred by a disabled worker in transportation to and from work. The purpose of this bill is to assist these disabled individuals in returning to a full and useful life. This is the proper purpose, in my estimation, of every program of aid to the disabled—to put them back in the position of helping themselves and not to make them permanently wards of the State welfare programs.

By the definition of this bill, one is disabled if he "has lost the use of a leg, or both legs, or of both arms, to such an extent that he is unable during the entire taxable year to use, without undue hardship or danger, a streetcar, bus, subway, train, or similar form of public transportation, as a means of traveling to and from work." The expenses thus included are those necessary for the individual to be gainfully and independently employed. It would help the individual to help himself.

In our society one of the problems which still seeks solution is that of the integration of the disabled individual into the mainstream of community life. It is a goal which these individuals desire to have attained and one which is desirable for the benefit of society.

TAX CREDIT TO ENCOURAGE BASIC RESEARCH

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in 1957, the National Science Foundation, in a report to the President, indicated that America's basic research efforts must be substantially increased. Progress in the modern world is intimately linked to the efforts of basic research and to maintain America's scientific and industrial preeminence we must encourage basic scientific research in this country.

To this end, I have today reintroduced legislation which would permit tax concessions to individuals and corporations for their contributions to basic research. For individuals, contributions to universities or nonprofit organizations for basic research would be treated as a credit against taxes. By the provisions of the bill, the individual taxpayer could claim 90 percent of his contribution as a credit against his tax liability, up to a total of 5 percent of that liability. For businesses which undertake basic research, there would be a credit of 75 percent of the contribution made up to a total of 3 percent of the tax liability.

The control of the incidence of the tax burden has proven to be an effective way to encourage certain activities and discourage others. What it does, in effect, is tell the individual or corporate taxpayer, "We will not order you to make certain expenditures and not others, for this is the legitimate area of personal choice; the disposition of your funds is in your hands alone. We will, however, recognize expenditures which contribute to the general welfare, we will encourage better exercise of your right to do with your funds as you see fit, and we will do this by making the amounts so spent or some part of them free from taxation." The legitimate right of choice remains with the taxpayer, both in the question of how to spend his money and its exact distribution among the competing areas of basic research.

Such a system would be, in my estimation, far preferable to a program by which the Federal Government would underwrite these costs. Guarantees of the good faith of the research expenditures would be left in the hands of the universities and nonprofit organizations where they are involved and in the hands of a certifying board of scientists where corporations are concerned. This bill would foster our national progress in the context of individual freedom which has been so important to our growth in the past.

PRINTING OF REMARKS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the final determination, the Congress of the United States has as its primary function the consideration and enactment of the legislation which will be observed in the country. Our efforts in this House are turned to that end, and it is essential that the Rules of the House of Representatives help promote it. One of the important parts of this consideration is the debate which occurs on the floor of the House. It is, and should be, the testing ground of ideas, the place in which a proposal must stand or fall on its merits. It is also one of the major channels by which information of what occurs in the Halls of Congress gets back to the people, either directly or through the news media.

The reporting of congressional debates through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, provided for in the Constitution, assumes special importance in this day in which it is beyond the physical capacity of a Member of Congress to report directly to his constituents. This being the case, it is clear that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should, insofar as is possible, reflect what was said on the floor of the House, those statements which appear in it that were made in open debate and subject to rebuttal by those of opposing views.

At the present time, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not accurately reflect what has been said in open debate. By the rules of the House, a Member may, by leave of the House, revise or extend his remarks, putting into the RECORD of spoken debate matters which were never said on the floor. This is an example of just such a use of this privilege to revise and extend. These remarks were not spoken on the floor of the House; they were inserted by permission into the RECORD.

I do not contend that this privilege is given without good reason. Rather, I commend it; without it the remarks of 437 Members of this body could not, by limitations of time, be made a part of the RECORD, as well they should. Without it time better used in the presentation of legislative matters for consideration would be consumed in reading material for insertion into the RECORD.

Nor do I condemn the other use of the privilege, the original use—that of permitting a Member to put into more cogent language his statements made in the heat of debate. This is often necessary for the true sense of a colloquy or debate to be made clear. But in this area, too, abuses have arisen which endanger the integrity of the congressional forum. As previously mentioned, matters not spoken on the floor of the House may appear in its official RECORD; entire speeches, not subject to the testing of debate, may be added. The second problem of which I speak is perhaps even more dangerous. Under the guise of making a statement more comprehensible, a Member may, if he so wishes, add to or delete from his statement, changing its meaning entirely, or making the statements in reply to his meaningless. This has happened to me; I am sure it has happened to many other Members also.

It is clear that in either context, that of the speech not open to rebuttal on the floor or that of the change in meaning made while revising comments spoken in open debate this threatens the integrity of congressional forum in its reported form.

In order to overcome these weaknesses and to return to the official RECORD of the House its proper place as an accurate report of what has transpired in House debate, I have reintroduced a resolution which would require that, in the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a change in type-face for those items which appear in it but which were not spoken on the floor of the House. There would be no limitation beyond that which now exists on the right of a Member of Congress to alter or add to what he said; it would rather permit those who read it to be able to distinguish between that which has stood the test of open debate and that which has not.

I urge upon the serious consideration of my colleagues the problem which I have outlined and the solution which I have offered.

REPUBLICAN WHIP

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the membership that we on our side have again designated the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, to be the Republican whip during this Congress.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce for the benefit of the House that the rule just reported out of the Committee on Rules will be brought up for consideration of the House on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOLLAND and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 25, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

474. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 68); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

475. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year 1959 (H. Doc. No. 69); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

476. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Facilities Corporation, General Services Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

477. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

478. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), transmitting a report certifying by rank and age groups, the number of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander in the Navy with the average monthly flight pay authorized by the law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period prior to January 1, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

479. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) negotiated fixed-price contracts AT (05–1)–709 and AT(05–1)–765 with the Western Nuclear Corp. (WNC) for the procurement of uranium concentrates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

480. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of November 30, 1960, pursuant to the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

481. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the study and recommendations as to the appropriate participation by the Federal Government in the West Virginia Centennial of 1963, pursuant to Public Law 86–508; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

482. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to operations carried out by the Immigration and Naturalization Service during the period ending December 31, 1960, in Austria, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Lebanon, pursuant to Public Law 86–648; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

483. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of Treasury Department positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

484. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, relative to furnishing the necessary information for the U.S. General Accounting Office on its positions and their incumbents in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 127. A resolution providing that during the 87th Congress the Committee on Rules shall be composed of 15 Members; without amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3150. A bill to amend section 902(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so that the criminal penalties provided therein will apply to violations of civil aeronautics safety regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 3151. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3152. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 3153. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 3154. A bill to provide emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3155. A bill to confirm the establishment of the Arctic National Wildlife Range, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3156. A bill to make the Panama Canal Company immune from attachment or garnishment of salaries owed to its employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3157. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3158. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3159. A bill to permit certain foreign-flag vessels to land their catches of fish in the Virgin Islands in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3160. A bill to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 3161. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage basic research in science by the allowance of a tax credit for contributions and other expenditures for basic research in science; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 3163. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 3164. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 3165. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3166. A bill to establish and maintain the U.S. Maritime Service as a uniformed service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3167. A bill to prohibit the transfer to the General Services Administration of custodial employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3168. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit employees with at least 30 years of service to retire at 55 years of age with full annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 3169. A bill to extend benefits under the civil service retirement system to certain former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3170. A bill to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 3171. A bill to provide for the construction of recreation facilities in the Elephant Butte Reservoir area, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 3172. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to State veteran agencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 3173. A bill to extend service pension benefits to certain persons who served honorably as commissioned officers in the Philippine Constabulary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3174. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 3175. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3176. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 3177. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not exceeding $175,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway from the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina and Tennessee to the Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky, and the Natchez Trace Parkway in Tennessee; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 3178. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for the payment of benefits under such act to certain citizens and permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3180. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that employers having pension plans under which payments are correlated with social security benefits shall be subject to an additional tax in cases where increases in such benefits result in a reduction in their own contributions under such plans and are not passed on to their retired employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3181. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States, and to encourage and promote actions by foreign governments to improve their own levels of such wages and working conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 3182. A bill to amend chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the construction, repair, modernization, and alteration of State homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3183. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to improve the effectiveness of the Veterans' Administration loan guaranty program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3184. A bill to extend the direct loan program for Korean conflict veterans and provide an earlier termination date for the World War II loan guarantee and direct loan programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 3185. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 3186. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3187. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 3188. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 3189. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 3190. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3191. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 3192. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3193. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 3194. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3195. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 3196. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 3197. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 3198. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 3199. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 3200. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 3201. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 3202. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3203. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 3204. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 3205. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3206. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 3207. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 3208. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3209. A bill to create a National Peace Agency and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.J. Res. 161. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution providing for the reimbursement of Members of the House of Representatives for amounts expended by them for certain travel and subsistence; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARING:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 128. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 92; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 129. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives so as to restore the 21-day rule; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. Res. 130. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect

to the printing of remarks of Members of the House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 3210. A bill for the relief of Our Lady of the Lake Church; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 3211. A bill for the relief of Jerzy Czajkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 3212. A bill for the relief of Efstathia Varela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3213. A bill for the relief of Beddo Terzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3214. A bill for the relief of Chao-Wei Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 3215. A bill for the relief of Eduard Nicolas Theodorus Muller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3216. A bill for the relief of Anna Kuhweider Krenn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H.R. 3217. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tom Shue Hai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 3218. A bill for the relief of Roger Chong Yeun Dunne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 3219. A bill for the relief of Vita Schiralli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Teachers Guide for Earth and Space Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the outstanding contribution to education made by the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction in the preparation of a publication entitled "Teachers Guide for Earth and Space Science."

The National Aviation Education Council stated they appreciated the opportunity of reproducing this book for the teachers of America.

Dr. Charles H. Boehm, superintendent of public instruction, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was awarded a citation of honor by the Air Force association at their meeting in San Francisco in September 1960, for his "outstanding contribution to space age education by establishing in the junior high schools of Pennsylvania, the Nation's first comprehensive course of study in aerospace science."

Dr. Boehm prefaced the publication with the following comments:

The idea for the earth and space science program was conceived at the 1958 Air Force convention in Dallas, Tex., when for the first time the swift progress being made in space travel and aerodynamics was demonstrated to a group of educators. This experience led to the realization that the space age in which we live and about which we still know so little will be commonplace to our children. Therefore, the inclusion of earth and space science in the programs of Pennsylvania's public schools has become an imperative issue.

We of Pennsylvania, are indeed proud of this achievement by our department of public instruction.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 55: 22: *Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and He shall sustain thee.*

Almighty God, together we turn to Thee with eager and earnest hearts, one in our need of divine guidance and wisdom, for the tasks and responsibilities of this new day.

Inspire us to walk diligently in the ways of Thy commandments and may we have poise and power of spirit when feelings and moods of fear and futility assail us.

Grant that in times of hardship and adversity we may prove faithful to our highest trusts and never recreant in discharging any duty.

May we be the messengers of help and hope to the struggling and troubled heart of humanity, lifting it to those heights whence cometh the strength of vision and victory.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

POSTPONEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF RULES CHANGE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I had announced that the resolution concerning the Committee on Rules would be brought up tomorrow; but some Members are unable to be here. Some Members understood, by implication at least, that there would be a 72-hour layover period before the rule would come up. Because of these circumstances, instead of bringing it up tomorrow, it will be programed for next Tuesday.

POSTPONEMENT OF RULES CHANGE CONSIDERATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this is not said in any spirit of criticism, but this postponement was unknown to me until I came here on the floor today. I should like the RECORD to show also that our Members were alerted to be here. As a result, many of them canceled engagements they had out of town and many who were honoring commitments in their districts have made extraordinary efforts to be here. I had understood that a 48-hour notice was what was involved, and that this notice had been given. It was understood by all of us that the vote would come on Thursday. Of course, the majority leader has given us the reason for the postponement, and I am not going to argue with that, nor contend against it nor question it. But I think it should be fairly well understood that there have been efforts at the Cabinet level to call Members on our side in the last few hours. Perhaps other moves may be in contemplation—I do not know. In any event, there is nothing we in the minority can do, of course, except to go along with the revised programs as announced.

POSTPONEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF RULES CHANGE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.